



Yours truly
Wm. Gordon

THE VEDDER LECTURES, 1877.

THE SCIENCE OF REVEALED TRUTH IMPREGNABLE

AS SHOWN BY THE ARGUMENTATIVE FAULTS OF

Infidelity and Theoretical Geology.

A Course of Lectures

DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS OF THE THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY AND OF RUTGERS COLLEGE, AT
NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY.

BY

W. R. GORDON, S.T.D.,

AUTHOR OF "THE SUPREMACY OF CHRIST," "PARTICULAR
PROVIDENCE PROVED BY THE HISTORY OF JOSEPH," "A THREE-
FOLD TEST OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM," "ESSAYS ON THE
COMING AND KINGDOM OF CHRIST," "THE CHURCH
AND HER SACRAMENTS," ETC., ETC.

"I lie not against the Truth."—JAMES 3:14

NEW YORK:
BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA,
34 VESLEY STREET.

1878.

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1873,
BY WILLIAM R. GORDON,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| TRUTH IN GENERAL, REVEALED TRUTH IN PARTICULAR. | |
| THE <i>à priori</i> ARGUMENT, | 9 |

LECTURE II.

| | |
|---|----|
| REVEALED TRUTH. THE <i>à posteriori</i> ARGUMENT, . . . | 69 |
|---|----|

LECTURE III.

| | |
|---|-----|
| REVEALED TRUTH. THE <i>à posteriori</i> ARGUMENT, . . . | 123 |
|---|-----|

LECTURE IV.

| | |
|---|-----|
| THEORETICAL GEOLOGY AND THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY, . | 177 |
|---|-----|

LECTURE V.

| | |
|---|-----|
| THEORETICAL GEOLOGY AND THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY, | 237 |
|---|-----|

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.



THE "Church militant" is a phrase which, however distasteful, the Church is obliged to own as measurably descriptive, because of the antagonism of the world. In her current history circumstances often arise, through the tactics of her enemies, that require restatements and new adjustments of the general argument by which the interests of revealed truth must ever be defended. From this contest she need expect no exemption until her Lord shall come to put an end to it. Meanwhile, however weary, she must not grow impatient in the necessary duty of "contending for the faith once delivered to the saints." The exigencies of the times, if we may judge from his "Will," seemed to the Founder of this lectureship to require such a presentation of the argument anew as should pay especial attention to the "present aspects of modern infidelity," which, seemingly, are as newly chiselled faces to the old stones of a badly battered and dismantled fortress. Whatever the *aspects*, however, infidelity is always and everywhere the same old malignant in spirit and intent; but its weapons and its

onsets may be expected to vary with the fancies and self-accredited resources of new opponents. To meet this requirement is the aim of the present volume. Recently new champions, calling themselves scientists, have taken the field, and propose to continue a raking fire upon the Bible, converging from castles in the air, based upon the Nebular Hypothesis, and from the earthworks erected upon the ground of Theoretical Geology, which they seem to think will do the business for the old book and all its adherents; especially since some of its avowed friends have taken in hand to *reconcile* it with these scientists' position—admitted by said friends to be irrefutable—whom on that account they hail as efficient coadjutors in demolishing the citadel of Christianity. Though in their judgment nothing is needed in its place, yet they propose, as best befitting human faith, the old theory of Materialism, with old cognate errors, to which they have added some fantastic ones of their own; and thus, with other revivals, we are to have, mayhap, a revival of Paganism within the domain of the Gospel! By large pretensions to *wisdom*—we do not dispute their *knowledge*—as advanced scientists, entitled on that account to lead in the van of public opinion, and to the deference of the world as well, they seek to overawe the *ignorance* of theologians and of all Christian people. Such are the facts just now. This determination appears to be as serenely calm as the bosom of that ancestral sponge at the bottom of the deep from which they say they have been developed. In

the present attempt nothing new is sought, because nothing new is needed; and nothing new will be expected, unless it be in arrangement, adaptation, and method required by the new position and approved missiles of modern assailants. They, however, only superadd physics to metaphysics; and, by the help of the living and the dead, hope to make the combination argumentatively successful. Moreover, they are greatly encouraged in their hope of success by the writings of certain Christian geologists, who having adopted their theory of the vast age of the earth, have attempted to force the cosmogony of Moses into harmony with it. Such efforts have not only failed, but have yielded all that infidelity cares to ask for the logical subversion of the Scriptures as the inspired Word of God given to man as his only rule of faith and practice. This advantage bestowed upon modern infidelity was by no means meant; on the contrary, it was intended to take away the infidel's objection to the Bible, arising from his theoretical geology; but it has had the contrary effect, and elicited his contempt instead of his admiration, while he rejoices in the concessions made. In the last two lectures the author has attempted, so far as he could, to undo the mischief unintentionally occasioned. The effort may cost, but he feels willing to bear, conscious of aiming to do a duty just now required by the exigencies of the times.

The audience to whom the following lectures were delivered will see that, as published, they are greatly extended. The explanation is that

no one of them, as written for the occasion, was fully delivered, for reasons which need not here be given. This was the less regretted, by the author at least, because in the intention of the Founder they were to be prepared for the press as well as for the lecture-room; and inasmuch as they were designed for others more exposed to the danger of imbibing moral poison than the well-instructed students, whose especial benefit was first consulted, simplicity of style, condensation, and suggestiveness were the points aimed at by the writer.

Because the fund invested for this lectureship unfortunately has been ridden on a rail until exhausted, that was not considered a valid reason for withholding from the Church, work to which she had appointed him, since it is the way of Providence to make feeble means reach important ends. Though sensible of defects which may need the forbearance of his brethren, he has no apology to make. If the lectures are good, they need none; if bad, they deserve none; and so he commits them to the Lord and his Church, especially that part of it in which he began his ministry, and in which he has been permitted to serve continuously for a period as long as that which the Israelites spent in the wilderness.

LECTURE I.

TRUTH IN GENERAL, REVEALED TRUTH IN PARTICULAR.

THE À PRIORI ARGUMENT.

Human knowledge defective—Life—Inadequate definitions—Some of our scientists materialists—"The breath of lives"—The human soul an entity—Its necessities—What is Truth?—Definition—Divisions—Revealed Truth a science—*Reason* defined—Difference between it and *Reasoning*—Its processes: *à priori*, *à posteriori*—Dishonesty of argument—Dr. Johnson—Wilberforce—Rousseau, and remarkable quotations from him—What is Infidelity?—Our sacred volume—The *à priori* process upon a proposition, in ten particulars—The same upon another, in five particulars—To maintain the part of a consistent liar most difficult—Brief accounts of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—Remarkable characteristics of the Gospels—The Hero of their story—His wonderful character and career—Its invention impossible—The Christian religion original in plan, doctrine, and adaptation—The *à priori* argument of infidelity a conspicuous failure—Correctly conducted, this process rolls up an overwhelming argument in favor of Revealed Truth.

THE American Centennial Exposition of 1876, to which all the nations of the earth largely contributed in honor of our country, naturally enough dazed the mind of every beholder, awak-

ened his admiration, and prompted his pride on account of the marvellous capabilities of man. But the abiding impression, after all, is this. Investigation and effort, on all subjects inviting them, steadily prove that human knowledge, at most, is very defective, and human power, at best, very limited. The first is imported from the world without by means of the five senses, all liable to deception and derangement; the second is restrained by inexorable laws, in obedience to which it must work out its own small achievements.

Take, for example, the plainest things. What are the natures, how the combinations, and whence the energy of those few well-known elements that compose the universe? What is the nature, why the qualities, and how the operation of light? What the nature of that supposable imponderable substance existing between the atmospheres of planets, stars, and suns? By what imaginable process could they have been formed? What is the cause of action and counteraction between those forces that keep whirling masses of matter of various sizes and densities in their allotted circuits with such wonderful exactitude? Nay, let us come down to our own little planet, with easier questions. Our philosophers show us the proximate causes of rain, dew, frost, hail, snow, and explain the occurrences of atmospheric changes, of thunder and storm. These are phenomena at our very feet, or suspended just above our heads; but when explanation ventures but a little way back in the line of causation, how very soon does it need itself to be explained? How

soon in the effort does it stammer and stop? As clear light becomes obscure when it enters the bosom of the ocean, growing fainter and fainter in its downward progress, until lost in the darkness of the deep, so in their explanations, from the first immediate visible to the first mediate invisible, and so on to the next more deeply hidden cause, at only one or two removes, they come to an abyss where the wit of man is plunged in total darkness. Yet, regardless of this, some sturdy scientists of our day imply in their wastefully worded utterances that, by right of discovery, as the successful explorers of nature, they may assume to regulate the faith of mankind at the expense of what has long been accepted as revealed truth; and in many instances at the expense of rejecting God himself. This fact is not new in the world—only the method of it.

PROF. HAECKEL, a materialist, says ("History of Creation," vol. ii, p. 123): "We need not trouble ourselves at all about the attacks of theologians and other unscientific men, who really know nothing whatever of nature." But, with great deference, we may be allowed to ask: What now constitutes the superiority of qualification that justifies this assumed position? Surely it must be an acquired ability to reach and unfold the mysteries of nature, which have hitherto bid defiance to all powers of human penetration. Let us see. Some things which are most familiar to us are confessedly at the farthest remove beyond our powers of penetration. Such, for example, is the principle of life. Who can tell us what it is?

Our scientists, be sure ; upon whose opinions, in more important matters, they ask us, " who really know nothing whatever of nature," to rely.

CUVIER, in his "Animal Kingdom," tells us that "*Life is that condition of being in which the form is more essential than the matter.*" No doubt ; but this is stating simply the difference between the organic and the inorganic, of which we need no information.

ALPHONSE DE CANDOLLÈ, in his "History of the Sciences," says: "*Life is the transformation of physical or chemical motion into plastic or nervous motion.*" No doubt ; but that is stating an effect, not the cause of it.

HERBERT SPENCER, in his "Principles of Psychology," says: "*Life is the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations.*" No doubt ; but this is informing us of no information.

And again, in his "Biology," he says: "*Life is the definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with external co-existences and sequences.*" But to say that life is a "*combination of changes*" is to utter an evident absurdity.

DR. PARIS, after others, says: "*Life is the totality of those functions that resist death.*" No doubt ; but this is saying a solemn nothing in dignified formality of speech.

DR. BUCHNER, equally lucid, says: "*Life is a peculiar and most complicate form of mechanical action, in which the usual mechanical laws act under the most unusual and most varied conditions, and in which the final results are separated from the origi-*

nal causes by such a number of intermediate links that their connection is not easily established." No doubt, perhaps, if we can get at the meaning of this cumbersome verbiage, which seems to be a definition by a declaration of ignorance of the thing defined.

PROF. CARL VOGT helps us to understand the meaning of these learned utterances by saying, scientifically, in regard to the highest manifestations of life, that "*thought stands in the same relation to the brain as the bile to the liver or the urine to the kidneys.*"

Such is the profound babble of those who accuse us of really knowing nothing whatever of nature. How happy they must feel in this self-complacency! Our modern scientists, such as these, are the grossest materialists imaginable, and although ambitious of being esteemed men of profound erudition, are only, by their own showing, men of *uncommon* sense. They are ever talking about "vital force," but we have the authority of PROF. VOGT himself for affirming that this talk means nothing but the keeping up of appearances. He says: "The appeal to a vital force is merely a periphrasis for ignorance. It constitutes one of those back doors, of which there are so many in science." But unfortunately this "back door" is the very one most in use when these learned authors are pushed upon such questions as that of life, and of other recondite matters which they assume to solve in such marvellous definitions as they have given. Nor can they tell us any more about *where* life is than *what* it is. To help their wild

imaginations* they learnedly appeal to the microscope, and talk about the discovery of *protoplasm*, which is "germinal matter," "a corpuscule of mucus without component parts," and is alike the basis of life in the *Monera*, which are "primæval creatures of the simplest kind conceivable, produced by spontaneous generation," according to PROF. HAECKEL ("History of Creation," vol. ii., p. 41), and in *Man* as well, thence developed, according to Darwin's "Theory of Descent." But the Bible informs us that "the life is in the blood," and the microscope yields us evidence as conclusive, at least, as that claimed for its existence in a bit of mucus. Upon such imbecility, clothed with the garments of learning, do these ingenious gentlemen venture to impose upon the common-sense of mankind.

The truth is, life, like many other things, eludes all definition. We only know that it is an organizing principle, of which there are three forms, differing in manifestation. These forms are vegetable life, known by growth; animal life, known by locomotion; and spiritual life, known by rationality, consciousness, and moral feeling. We know of no other form except a combination of these in

* Prof. Huxley says in his speech at Nashville, "I know it is thought very often that men of science are in the habit of drawing largely from their imaginations, but it is really not so." We beg pardon for differing with him on this point, and in proof of our being right we point to Prof. Haeckel's "Spontaneous Generation," as we might in many instances to Darwin, Spencer, and Huxley himself in his absurdity about "Bathybius," which he has now given up as too heavy a draught upon his own imagination.

human nature. Revealed truth teaches us, in opposition to the theories of materialists, that God "formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." But the original is in the plural—"THE BREATH OF LIVES." It is certainly remarkable that this descriptive language should be made to indicate plurality in the vital principle imparted. *God inspirited man with the spirit of lives.* Be sure this may be said to be simply a form of speech, meant only to intensify expression, just as God speaks of himself in the plural, "let us make man," indicating nothing more than the *singular* of dignity; but it is not proven, and is not true, for the reason that it is a pure assumption. God never stood in need of expressing the dignity of his nature in this way. It was quite too early, when Moses wrote, for the substitution of one number of a pronoun for another in descriptive language; and ever after such an expedient was contrary to the usage of the Hebrew tongue. This language is not allegorically figurative, but historically literal. As the author wrote not like a rhetorician, nor like a philosopher, nor yet like a physiologist, he nevertheless stated a fact that our physiology accepts and teaches, namely, that in man is found this very trinity of lives—the vegetable, distinguished by growth; the animal, by locomotion; the spiritual, by rationality and consciousness. Now the method of imparting this compound life, and the terms descriptive of it, are highly suggestive as to that thing we call *human nature*. Breath is

a term used in the Scriptures sometimes to mean spirit; and in-breathing is another to denote the act of imparting spirit. As it would be absurd to suppose that God breathed oxygen out of himself to vitalize the first human form, we are clearly compelled to interpret the words descriptive of this culminating creative act as necessarily meaning that something more than mere life went out from God's creative power into this noblest form, capacitated to receive and retain the "likeness" of himself, which for obvious reasons no fleshly form nor any other could. Now, since God is defined to be a spirit, this *something more* must have been a spirit also, possessed of certain similarities necessary to constitute an "image;" and for the additional reason that this *something more* was not imparted to any other of living creatures, many varieties of which breathed the breath of life *before* Adam did, and as he did. Supposing it to have been the intent of Moses to teach the creation of a spiritual entity as the great distinguishing *fact* of the superiority of human nature over the brutal, can we think of any form of words that could more forcibly and so concisely express it? Or supposing he only meant to say that man "became a living being," can we see the necessity or the propriety of verbal surplusage in the statement of a fact already indicated by the animal creation, every one of which had "become a living being" before him? Man, be sure, is an animal; but he is something more. Hence the phrase—"became a living soul"—to be distinctively descriptive, must mean a spiritual entity apart

from mere life and its functions. He was made in the image of his glorious Author, spiritual, intelligent, capable of immortality; and for the accommodation of a being so nobly formed, his bodily structure was "made upright," and vitalized by "the breath of lives."

It is in accordance with human experience that man's necessities are great in proportion to this complexity of his nature, and the enlargement of the sphere of his possible attainment. By his material organization there is necessity that he must eat, drink, sleep, and put forth such activity as is prompted by the instincts of animal life, under the penalty of inevitable decay. His spiritual life, in like manner, demands an aliment and an activity required by its necessities, under the penalty of ill-being for the entire length of the soul's duration. And as the Author of his existence has bountifully provided for its corporeal part, possessed in common with the lower creation, we cannot avoid the conclusion that he has as bountifully arranged for the wants of its spiritual part, which the lower creation does not possess in common with him. By an arrangement upon the principle of adaptation, everywhere seen in creation as the evidence of contriving benevolence, the human spirit can only grow into the capabilities of mental and moral strength, and up to its attainable excellence of faculty and force; for where there is failure in this growth, ignorance becomes the source of mental degradation, and sin the mother of woe—both uniting to display the horrors of savagism, not only as seen in the dark corners of the earth,

but as unfolded by the daily prints of our own boasted civilization. How preposterous, then, is the assumption of our materialistic scientists, that man, having all requisite resources within himself, no more needs a revelation from God than the beasts of forest and field !

If it be our happiness to know what to select as proper food for the health and growth of the body, no less is it our unspeakable advantage to know what aliment is needed for the welfare of the soul. This is TRUTH. Truth, suited to the spiritual appetite of the soul, is the only thing adapted to its nature ; the only thing that will secure its health and promote its growth in whatever constitutes its happiness. As the body of a man thrives by what it feeds upon, or sickens and dies by poisoned food, so the soul grows and thrives by the life-keeping power of truth, or pines and perishes by the poison of error. What the act of eating is to the body, the act of believing is to the soul ; as the thing eaten, and not the act of eating, is that which supports the life of the body or kills it, so the thing believed, and not the act of believing, is the procuring cause of health or disease to the soul ; and as the nutriment of the one is taken up by its ten thousand absorbents and carried to all parts for strength and repair, so the food of the other, taken up by the powers of thought, reason, and judgment, is worked over and over, and made one with itself by digestion and transfusion throughout its whole spiritual being. Nothing can be plainer than this.

But what is TRUTH ? Pilate's question will bear

repeating, yet we cannot afford to be as thoughtless as he in propounding it. The word is well known to be Saxon, derived from *troth* or *trust*, and indicates that which is trustworthy, or the *matter* of trust, apart from the act of it. TRUTH, strictly speaking, means the reality of facts and things. Facts are incidents which come to pass; things are objects in existence; though these terms are often loosely used as interchangeable. Their reality covers their substance, natures, relations, and adjustments in the constitution of the universe. But inasmuch as truth includes both the state and the statement of facts and things, our definition needs some enlargement; and therefore we say that *truth is the agreement of thought and speech with the reality of facts and things*. Falsehood, on the other hand, is disagreement in these particulars, indicating the errors of mind and heart in those who deceive and are deceived. The condition of both will be good or bad, according to choice. As the cravings of bodily hunger will make the appetite seize, in extremity, upon noxious if unable to get nutritious food, so the craving soul, if it do not get truth, will devour error regardless of results—the only difference being this unhappy one, that the respective instincts of body and soul are not equally reliable for right selection. The reason is familiar to those upon whom our materialistic scientists bestow their impotent contempt, and accounts for the ill condition of the human race. This much, however, may be said: There is a natural congeniality between the mind and truth, and if the intellect be allowed fair play

by the passions, what is once accepted by good evidence for fact cannot afterwards be taken for fiction ; yet it is our unhappy experience that passion has got the reins, and rides the reason with whip and spur. Truth, as an abstract subject of thought, is one and indivisible ; but for the convenience of study is presented in subdivisions, exemplified by the species of a genus, and accordingly we specify :

1. PHYSICAL TRUTH, sometimes called *objective*, embracing facts and things in nature recognized by the senses, such as are grouped in Geography, Chemistry, Physiology, and Medical Science.

2. METAPHYSICAL TRUTH, not cognizable by the senses, but embracing the facts and things of mind, is known by the terms of Psychology and Mental Philosophy.

3. MORAL TRUTH, embracing the facts and things of our moral in distinction from our mental nature, includes the sciences of Moral Philosophy, Political Economy, Law, and Government.

4. LOGICAL TRUTH relates to facts and things of faith and conduct made clear by the reasoning faculty for the guidance of both. Its method is the Art of Persuasion.

5. MATHEMATICAL TRUTH embraces the facts and things discoverable by numbers, measurements, and quantities, and refers to Arithmetic, Algebra, Trigonometry, and cognate sciences employing its means of calculation.

6. HISTORICAL TRUTH, comprises the facts and things of the past too remote for our personal ob-

servation, and includes Narrative, Biography, and Chronology.

7. REVEALED TRUTH embodies facts, things, relations, doctrines, and duties not discoverable by human reason or research, but brought within our knowledge by supernatural agency. All this is contained in the HOLY BIBLE.

Revealed truth, relating to all the future of eternity no less than to the whole period of time, is, on that account, more important to the welfare of man than the whole encyclopædia of knowledges as above indicated, because these respect the interests of man throughout time, while this respects his highest interest through eternity, to which there is no *outlet*. Upon each of these species of truth every one may know more or less as he likes; but the more he knows, and the better he knows it, the greater will be his intellectual grasp and power of retention. These seven divisions, each having its own peculiar principles and doctrines, make up the general subject of Truth; and as the seven colors are combined in the effulgence of white light, so these are united in the great principle of mental and moral illumination, which irradiates, expands, and qualifies the mind for its highest dignity in the flesh; and, out of the flesh, for approximation toward the glorious Source of all things, "in whom it lives and moves and has its being." I mention these divisions of truth mainly for the sake of prominence to the remarkable fact that, while each of them has its own peculiar set of proofs to enforce the consent of the mind, none of them has met with opposition, ex-

cept the one last named, whose claims are the most powerful upon the attention and confidence of all men. The great wonder prominent among mental and moral phenomena is resistance to these claims by men whose scientific attainments should seemingly forbid; while multitudes of equally sound minds, but of less pretensions, yield it the homage of head and heart. The only conceivable explanation is that in the former cases mind and heart have not been put to the same school. Men of cultured intellect, but, as themselves have shown, of uncultured moral nature, have claimed the right of rebellion against it, on the score of possessing an all-sufficient reason, set up by themselves as the court of last resort on all questions fairly coming within the province of revealed truth for decision.

In the outset of remonstrance this much is freely granted them: Reason is the judge of what is reasonable. I do not mean the particular reason of any one man or set of men, but the general, the universal reason of mankind, whose intuitions and perceptions are common to the race, and mainly uniform. These, unbiassed by individual agencies or otherwise, are always trustworthy; and because of their omnipresence in every generation, there is no such thing as a universal error. Upon them we can rely to almost any extent for ability to discriminate between the true and the false, the right and the wrong in the details of duty. Of what conceivable use is the faculty of reason above brutal instinct, if she cannot arrive at the certainty of substantial truth? If the latter

insures good results to brutality, shall not the former insure superior results to humanity? To this end was reason made superior to instinct, and implanted in the soul of man, the glory of his being. Yet is reason lame and blind and dumb as to any power adequate to discovery or decision upon those great subjects that come within the scope of revealed truth. I hope this will be made clear in appearance, as it is incontrovertible in fact.

The distinction between the modes of operation which reason takes for the discovery of truth must be clearly pointed out, since her processes vary according to the kinds of subject upon which she labors. My meaning is that reason, in the nature of things, cannot work out moral and mathematical questions by the same method. We all know that. We all see there is as great a difference between moral and mathematical qualities of truth as there is between the sciences of ethics and quantity. To meet this, reason has two hands to work with, and two ways of working, and is equally reliable for good results by both operations. Not even a tyro need be told that algebraic expressions are not adapted to expound moral truth, nor moral reasoning competent to prove a theorem; yet the legitimate proof of a proposition within the sphere of moral truth is just as sure for a certainty as the proof of any proposition within the sphere of mathematical truth. We need to nail this fact in the mind, if we would avoid many absurd mistakes that others have made.

REASON is the power of universal and necessary

conviction, whose appeal is always to her own intuitions, looking into truths above sense, and that have their evidence in themselves. REASONING is the working of contemplation upon facts and propositions submitted as coming within the sphere of this power, from which there is no appeal. Between them we must distinguish, however, as accurately as between a laborer and his work. If the laborer attempt that which is above or beyond his natural force, his work will be an abortion. So with reason: she is powerful within her own limited sphere, but powerless beyond it. As I have said, she has two methods of procedure in the execution of her work. The first, technically called the *à priori* process, creates probabilities. The second, technically called the *à posteriori* process, begets degrees of conviction.* When

* For the sake of those not familiar with the formative terms of logic, definitions are here given. By the *d priori reason* is meant the reason as it starts upon its work from perceptions and intuitions ingrained within itself, and necessary to itself. It must perceive, *e.g.*, that a whole is greater than its part. The distinction between truth and falsehood is, by necessity, intuitively seen. No argument is necessary to establish these and similar first truths. *Reasoning d priori* means the process by which reason works out an argument from its own resources. It lays down, *e.g.*, one of its own self-evident intuitions, and deduces consequences from it. Its argument is from cause to effect. It thus *diverges* from a starting-point within itself in lines of connected thought to reach a conclusion.

By the *d posteriori reason* is meant the reason as it starts upon its work from facts and things presenting themselves outside of itself. It begins with a view of them and the principles by which their nature and relations are determined, *converging* from facts and things its lines of thought to a final point or conclusion. *Reasoning d posteriori* means the process by which reason works

both unite upon a verdict on any matter fairly coming within the province of her court, reason pronounces it with a certainty morally felt to be sure as her own existence. But this union is necessary to such a degree of confidence. It must not be forgotten that each method has its own peculiar advantages, and a union of them all is necessary to establish an absolute confidence in what is held to be truth. When one mind attempts to produce conviction in another, a world-wide experience proves that *à priori* reasoning depends for its success more upon the state of the mind addressed than upon the argument addressing it; or if that mind rests upon this process alone for certainty to itself, it will most likely be deceived, because the power of its vision may be weakened or obscured by the influence of passion. It is otherwise with an *à posteriori*, argument, which does not so depend, but with its inductions increases light from without at every step. In the first instance the mind *should* believe, but may refuse, the power of intuition being subject to adverse influence; in the second, the mind *must* believe, and cannot refuse, because induction is subject to no such drawback. In the first instance the progress is slow from probability to probability until an accumulation of them shall cover all incidental

out an argument from the necessary connection of facts and events with their formative principles. It inducts consequences from premises outside of itself, and argues from effect to cause. "An individual may fall under suspicion of murder for two reasons: he may have coveted the deceased's property, or he may be found with it in his possession; the former is an *a priori*, the latter an *a posteriori* argument against him."

questions, leaving no room for doubt ; yet, at the same time, there is some chance at every point of advance for the income of *feelings* unfavorable to fairness of judgment ; in the second, an argument starting with that which admits of no doubt, goes on with increase of power. When both processes are expended upon a subject, the result is compulsion right up to a sure conclusion, satisfactory both to reason and conscience. Now, should anything claiming to come from God be found to offend the intuition of an unprejudiced reason, or violate the decisions of an intelligent conscience, it ought at once to be rejected as inconsistent with our mental and moral nature, and set aside as an imposition. But while it is true that the unbiassed intuition of reason and the impressions of a clear-sighted conscience are perfectly reliable, and nothing in revealed truth can contradict them, there must be a union of processes as above indicated ; for the *à priori*, perfectly sure so far as it goes, by itself, can take us but a little way, because it is *abstract* reasoning, and on that account needs the auxiliary *à posteriori*, which is *conjunct*.

I have purposely lingered around this point, because I wish it to be clearly understood, that the dishonesty of INFIDELITY may stand out like the block letters upon a sign I once saw over a low door of a theatre, informing the public of "The Way to the Pit." Whenever its adherents have attempted to argue at all, avoiding that upon which Christians lay the greatest argumentative weight, they have generally confined their efforts to the narrow limits of the *à priori* process,

like their great champions Voltaire and Hume, who, for reasons above given, while deceiving were deceived. They tell us it would be superfluous trouble to wade through the mass of our proffered *à posteriori* proof, and on this account: The Scriptures, say they, contain so many prodigies of witchcraft and wonders by invisible personal agencies, good and bad; so many interpositions among the affairs of men by angels and devils fighting for the mastery; so many vices adhering to the heroes of piety, while scrupulously moral men, like the Pharisees, are mercilessly denounced for hypocrisy; so many unnatural stories, like those of Jonah and Balaam; so many absurd doctrines, like that of the resurrection, it is simply an act of wisdom, at the dictate of intuitive reason, to close the Bible, since it carries with it the materials of its own refutation; and to reject the Christian religion, which was built upon the accredited facts and faithfulness of the Mosaic record, now torn to pieces by the remorseless logic of geological science. To all this, and more of the same sort of flippancy, we are frequently treated by unbelievers of every kind, but it is irrelevant. We regard candor in a critic of the first and last qualification to entitle his objections to respect. It is conceded on all hands that no man can urge objections against the doctrines of others which lie with equal weight against his own; and for this reason the assertions of the deist respecting the absurdities of the Bible are not worthy of any other reply than this. Your doctrine is that nature fully demon-

strates the benevolence of God, and natural religion, revealed in the book of nature, supersedes the Bible and the religion founded upon it as well. But there are similar difficulties in the book of nature, lying across the path of the deist's doctrine. Destructive calamities constantly occurring by means of volcanoes, earthquakes, the wars of the elements, inundations, the inequalities of the earth's surface and climate, the hard terms of subsistence imposed upon mankind, rendered still more afflictive by droughts and frequent famines, etc., prove, upon your own principles, that both the book and the religion of which you boast are equally worthless. His reply that these things, called natural evils, are, upon the whole, no evils at all, because nitre, sulphur, and carbon are thus driven all over the face of the earth, without which animal and vegetable life would perish, is an argument in favor of the cause he seeks to subvert; for, by the same judgment, he ought to perceive that the extraordinary claims of the Bible and its religion could never be otherwise adequately proved than by those extraordinary means with which he finds fault. Marvellous claims require marvellous proof. Why, is it not reasonable, and a proof of divine wisdom, that the God of natural truth should make nature afford overwhelming evidence that he is also the God of supernatural truth, proving the Scriptures to be heavenly documents for the instruction of men as to their moral duties and ultimate destiny? Balaam's ass, for example, speaking with an articulate voice for a given purpose, involves

no greater absurdity than the assertion that the most awful engines of death and destruction should be regarded as appropriate means, in the hands of divine benevolence, for preserving life and augmenting human happiness the world over. Thus we dispose of a crowd of small objections that largely make up the whole stock of the infidel's *à priori* argument.

Dr. Johnson on a certain occasion well observed that "no honest man could be a deist; for no man could be so after a fair examination of the proofs of Christianity." On being reminded of Hume by his auditor, "No, sir," said he; "Hume owned to a clergyman in the bishopric of Durham that he had never read the New Testament with attention." This no doubt is the case with them all.

"It is curious," says Wilberforce ("Practical View"), "to read the accounts which infidels give of themselves, the rather as they accord so exactly with the results of our own observation. We find that they once, perhaps, gave a sort of implicit hereditary assent to the truth of Christianity, and were what by a mischievous perversion of language the world denominates *believers*. How were they, then, awakened from their sleep of ignorance? At what moment did the light of truth beam in upon them and dissipate the darkness in which they had been involved? The period of their infidelity is marked by no such determinate boundary. Reason and thought and inquiry had little or nothing to do with it. Having lived for many years careless and irreligious lives, and associated with companions equally careless and

irreligious, not by force of study and reflection, but rather by the lapse of time, they at length attained to their infidel maturity. It is worthy of remark that when any are reclaimed from infidelity, it is generally by a process much more rational than that which has here been described. They examine, they consider, and at length yield their assent to Christianity on what they deem sufficient grounds."

While this is true of many who have escaped out of the deadly snare, it is quite otherwise with the majority, whose moral nature is so debased, by their own showing, that even their reason, perversely swayed by likes and dislikes, has no chance to work fairly under the circumstances. In proof of this I shall produce the testimony of a great man among them, who was also an example of moral corruption prevailing and presiding over the *à priori* judgment of his own mind. JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU still lives upon the roll of literary fame, whose name was of great brilliancy in its zenith, whose character was of great infamy at the same time, and whose opportunities of judging were equal to his powers of delineation. His well-known vigorous paragraphs, which I quote, should never be forgotten. He says :

"I have consulted our philosophers, I have perused their books, I have examined their several opinions; I have found them all proud, positive, and dogmatizing in their skepticism, knowing everything, proving nothing, and ridiculing one another—and this is the only point in which they concur, and in which they are right. Daring, when they attack, they defend themselves with vigor. If you consider their arguments, they have none but for destruction; if you count their number, each

one is reduced to himself, they never unite but to dispute; to listen to them was not to relieve my doubts. I conceive that the insufficiency of the human understanding was the first cause of the prodigious diversity of sentiment, and that pride was the second. If our philosophers were able to discover truth, which of them would interest himself about it? Each of them knows that his system is no better established than the others, but he supports it because it is his own; there is not one among them who, coming to distinguish truth from falsehood, would not prefer his own error to the truth that is discovered by another. Where is the philosopher who, for his own glory, would not willingly deceive the whole human race? Where is he who, in the secret of his heart, proposes any other object than his own distinction, provided he can best raise himself above the commonalty?—provided he can eclipse his competitors, he has reached the summit of his ambition. The great thing for him is to think differently from other people. Among believers he is an atheist; among atheists, a believer ”

“Shun, shun them,” he continues, “those who, under the pretence of explaining nature, sow in the hearts of men the most dispiriting doctrines, whose scepticism is far more affirmative and dogmatical than the most decided tone of their adversaries. Under the pretence of being themselves the only people enlightened, they impiously subject us to their magisterial decisions, and would fain palm upon us, for the true cause of things, the unintelligible systems they have erected in their own heads; whilst they overturn, destroy, and trample under foot all that man reveres: snatch from the afflicted the only comfort left them in their misery. from the rich and great the only curb that can restrain their passions · tear from the heart all remorse of vice, all hope of virtue, and still boast themselves the benefactors of mankind. ‘Truth,’ they say, ‘is never hurtful to man.’ I believe that, as well as they; and the same, in my opinion, is a proof that what they teach is not the truth.”—*Gregory's Letters.*

This is a picture dark and dismal, but true to the life at the time it was drawn. ROUSSEAU spoke from bitter experience. Fatally misled as he was, he turned “State’s evidence,” and proved himself able and willing to expose the wickedness of

others, not concealing his own. We have his own word for it, that he was a thief, liar, and profligate, upon an execrable principle he was not ashamed to avow. "I have only to consult myself concerning what I do. All that I *feel* to be right, is right. Whatever I *feel* to be wrong, is wrong. All the morality of our actions lies in the judgment we ourselves form of them." He attained a high eminence in authorship. His works were published in no less than twenty volumes, the best edition of 1824, with the notes of a talented editor. Perhaps no writer of his school has ever gained an influence so incisive, resulting from the eloquence, fervency, and fascination of style with which he defended his opinions. Preceded by Herbert, Hobbs, Woolston, and others of less note, cotemporary with Hume and Voltaire, all of whose works he had read, his opinion of them is competent and commanding, because he was enlisted in the same service and fought for the same object. His were the palmiest days of infidelity, and its defenders, whose mental acuteness no fair-minded man has ever disputed, whose moral sentiments no right-minded man has ever approved, had gained an influence like himself, more or less extensive ; yet, in the bitterness of disappointment and disgust, he sets them forth in a strong light as the *worst* enemies of mankind. We are entitled to the testimony of one who was in sympathy with them, yet displeased by their arrogant imbecility which they sought to palm off upon the world as intellectual strength and unanswerable argument ; and therefore, as a competent limner,

he painted them in fiery paragraphs, with a pencil dipped in carmine. To delineate the conflict that often distracts the heads and hearts of such men as ROUSSEAU in their better moments, I shall let him speak for himself again, in another quotation, singularly beautiful in thought and expression. He says :

“I will confess to you that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration, as the purity of the Gospel has its influence on my heart. Peruse the works of our philosophers, with all their pomp and diction, how mean, how contemptible are they compared with the Scriptures ! Is it possible that a book, at once so simple and sublime, should be merely the work of man ? Is it possible that the sacred personage, whose history it contains, should be himself a mere man ? Do we find that he assumed the tone of an enthusiast, or ambitious sectary ? What sweetness, what purity in his manners ! What an affecting gracefulness in his delivery ! What sublimity in his maxims ! What profound wisdom in his discourse ! What presence of mind in his replies ! How great the command over his passions ! Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live, and so die, without weakness and without ostentation ? When Plato described his imaginary good man, with all the shame of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he described the character of Jesus Christ ; the resemblance was so striking, that all the Christian fathers perceived it.

“What prepossessions, what blindness must it be to compare (Socrates) the son of Sophroniscus to (Jesus) the son of Mary ! What an infinite disproportion between them ! Socrates, dying without pain or ignominy, easily supported his character to the last ; and if his death, however easy, had not crowned his life, it might have been doubted whether Socrates, with all his wisdom, was any thing more than a vain sophist. He invented, it is said, the theory of morals ; others, however, had before put them in practice ; he had only to say, therefore, what they had done, and to reduce their examples to precepts. But where could Jesus learn, among his competitors, that pure and sublime morality, of which he only has given us both precept and example ? The death of Socrates, peacefully philosophizing with his

friends, appears the most agreeable that could be wished for; that of Jesus, expiring in the midst of agonizing pains, abused, insulted, and accused by a whole nation, is the most horrible that could be feared. Socrates, in receiving the cup of poison, blessed the weeping executioner who administered it, but Jesus, in the midst of excruciating tortures, prayed for his merciless tormentors. Yes! if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God. Shall we suppose the evangelistic history a mere fiction? In deed, my friend, it bears not the mark of fiction; on the contrary, the history of Socrates, which nobody presumes to doubt, is not so well attested as that of Jesus Christ. Such a supposition, in fact, only shifts the difficulty, without obviating it; it is more inconceivable that a number of persons should agree to write such a history, than that one should furnish the subject of it. The Jewish authors were incapable of the diction, and strangers to the morality contained in the Gospel, the marks of whose truths are so striking and inimitable, that the inventor would be a more astonishing character than the hero."

And yet, in proof of what I have said as to moral obliquity counteracting the reason of these infatuated men, the author of this contrast subjoined to it the declaration: "I cannot believe the Gospel!" Alas, poor Rousseau, to what a sad degree of moral distraction did the dark spirit of infidelity lead thee!

But what is Infidelity? It is *disbelief* of revealed truth, accompanied with *misbelief* as to some form of error. The two necessarily go together, and there is no choice in the matter; for every man must believe something. If he will not feed upon truth, he must devour error and become the victim of his own delusion. Now the absurdity of infidelity, as thus popularly understood, glaringly appears in the fact that it is a

moral insurrection of the heart against the reason, in which strong dislike blinds and perverts it, as in the case of ROUSSEAU. Men, under its sway, treat revealed truth as they treat no other form of truth—using arguments against it of which they would be utterly ashamed in other connections.

The proposition, for example, that the world moves round the sun, is sustained by adequate evidence, and is accepted as an astronomical truth, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary.

The proposition that Cæsar overran Gaul and made it part of the Roman empire, is a historical truth laid down in his Commentaries, and nobody calls it in question.

The proposition that the square of the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle is equal to the squares of the other two sides, is clearly proven, and no geometrician disputes it.

The proposition that two and two make *four*, is an intuitive truth, and held to be a mathematical necessity; everybody believes it, though one of our modern scientists, Mr. HUXLEY, holds that in some other sphere they may make *five*! *

In regard to these and similar things, reason has a fair chance to operate; and because the heart does not oppose, infidelity in regard to

* “Every candid thinker will admit that there may be a world in which two and two do not make four, and in which two straight lines do not inclose a space.”—*Evidences of Evolution*. He might as well have said that every thinker is uncandid, unless he admit that a triangle may be a circle, and a circle a square, in different sections of the universe; or that a lie, in the abstract, may be an absolute truth in either Venus or Jupiter.

them is not known. But if these truths were associated with man's moral nature, as it now is, so as to require him to accept the Scriptures and become obedient to the Christian faith, infidelity would not only contend that two and two might make five, but would find some pretext for doubting, if not denying, scientific truth altogether. This disbelief and misbelief go together in all who reject the Scriptures as inspired of God. Atheism, therefore, does not define infidelity; for while it is true that every atheist is an infidel, it is not true that every infidel is an atheist. The rejection of proof, indubitably true to an unbiased mind, sustaining the Scriptures in all their claims, is the crime of infidelity against both God and man; and, with Rousseau, I charge all infidels, himself included, with ill-design against both, no less than with inconsistency in rejecting revealed truth without an attempt to show that the peculiar proofs of it are inadequate, and inferior to the proof within the sphere of scientific truth which they accept without cavil.

Our sacred volume asserts for itself the authority of the ever-living God, but does not ask to be accredited upon mere assertion. For this extraordinary claim it submits appropriate and extraordinary proof, as the case demands; proof in rich abundance, lying inside, outside, and all around itself; proof that has stood the test of sifting ten thousand times, and as often declared impregnable; proof that is always the same, but cumulative with the lapse of years; and proof that has endured the teeth of infidelity for ages

without loss. By this evidence, like a munition of rocks around our volume, we hold it to be the casket of revealed truth, containing a perfect system of fact and doctrine, of means and ends, perfectly working for the realization of all it was intended to accomplish in the world; and therefore revealed truth is a SCIENCE, the noblest known among men. Infidelity, however, denies all this, coolly advancing the same objections that have been answered over and over again, just as though they were fresh from its own logical mint. Against it Christianity has notoriously kept and gained ground for nearly two thousand years, and now the burden of proof is more heavily upon the shoulders of gainsayers than ever before; but instead of sustaining it with un-failing strength, they have to beg for a resting-place upon the new-made ground of theoretical geology. Infidelity claims that reason, illumined by the light of science, obviates the necessity of revelation, for which there is no requirement within the domain of human want. Just here am I best pleased to meet it. For this position, the only support depended upon is, as has been shown, the *à priori* process; but unfortunately the argument thence derived must fail its adherents, because at variance with the *à priori* process itself, which subjects all propositions to the common intuitions of universal reason. Take,

First, the proposition that *there is one personal God, who has benevolently given to man for his guidance a system of revealed truth, which is the basis of the Christian religion*; what should the *à priori* reason

do with it? Clearly, without opening the Bible, it should argue upon the probabilities or improbabilities of that proposition in some such way as the following.

1. If there be no God, there can be no Creator ; if no Creator, there can be no creature ; if no creature, nothing was ever created ; if nothing was ever created, every thing exists without a first cause. If there is no first cause, there can be no second cause ; that is, no effect ; if no effect, there could have been no change ; and if no change, every thing now existing must have existed *as it is*, from the eternity of the past, and must continue so to exist to the eternity of the future. But this is absurd ; for, by the testimony of our senses and of all history, changes are constant, natural, unavoidable, necessary, in every thing and everywhere ; therefore, undeniably, there is a chain of effects, each link of which is the proximate *cause* of the one coming after. This chain is necessarily suspended upon a great first link, having the nature of a first cause ; and whatever that is, must be God ; because possessed of a mind shown to be intelligent, by adapting means to ends regularly reached by the operations of nature. Denying this, one must also deny the possibility of any effect ; and if there be no effect, nothing really exists but apparitions. Our very bodies and souls, in spite of consciousness, are only imaginary ; nay, not even that ; because there can be no imagination to fabricate an imaginary existence. But our existence is real, and the proof of it is, at the same time, the proof of a Crea-

tor, who is God. Thus *à priori* reason, beginning its work upon the aforesaid proposition, reaches the conclusion that it is infinitely more absurd to disbelieve the existence of God, than to believe it. Therefore nature teaches that there is a God, but the Bible teaches the same thing; *so far*, then, the Bible is true, because it accords with nature and reason. The Christian religion is founded on the truth of the Bible; *so far*, then, that is true also.

2. The *à priori* reason says: What all men, in every age and everywhere generally, simultaneously and unconventionally believe to be true, is true; because such is ascertained to have been and to be the inward conviction and outspoken voice of universal conscience. By the testimony of history, all men, of every sort, in all ages of the world, whatever peculiarities of customs or beliefs, with a few exceptions here and there not worth counting, have believed in one Supreme Eternal God; therefore, there is one such God, since there is no such thing as a universal speculative error. But this is the doctrine of the Bible; therefore, *so far* the Bible must be true. The Christian religion, founded on the Bible, notoriously teaches the same doctrine; *so far*, then, that is true also.

3. Non-existence cannot originate existence; because nothing cannot produce something. But the heavens and the earth are produced; therefore they are the effect of an adequate cause. Whatever produces must be greater than the thing produced, and since the producer must be the Maker of heaven and earth, he must be that

Supreme Power we call God. But the Bible teaches that God is omnipotent, and that he made heaven and earth. The Bible, then, is *so far* true ; but the Christian religion teaches the same thing ; therefore, *so far*, that is true also.

4. Nature is clearly a system of adaptations of means to ends, in a complicate contrivance for securing operations and results, such as we witness every day. Light, for example, adapted to the eye, and the eye to light. But a contrivance necessitates the existence of a contriver ; which, in turn, necessitates intelligence ; but there can be no intelligence without intellect, no intellect without thought, no thought without a thinker, and no thinker without a person. Nature, therefore, teaches that the Omnipotent God is a person. But the Scriptures teach the same truth ; therefore the Bible is, *so far*, true ; and since the Christian religion is founded on the Bible, *so far*, then, that is true also.

5. If there be one Omnipotent Personal God, his nature must be independent, spiritual, uncompounded, and eternal ; for every material thing is corruptible, and every compound thing imperfect. The contriver and his contrivance must forever be separate in nature and relation. Pantheism must, therefore, be an absurdity ; for, alleging that God is every thing, and every thing is God, confounding the Maker with the thing made, combining the material with the immaterial, making the mutable to be immutable, and the finite to be infinite as well, it does the greatest possible violence to reason and common-sense. The Bible teaches

the spirituality and simplicity of God ; therefore, *so far*, the Bible is true ; but the Christian religion teaches the same doctrine ; therefore, *so far*, that is true also.

6. The works of God prove that he is good. He cannot be a malevolent being ; for a bad cause cannot produce a good effect. The Bible proclaims the benevolence and the goodness of God ; *so far*, then, is the Bible true ; and *so far* is the Christian religion, which teaches the same doctrines, true also.

7. It is impossible for an intelligent being, who once had no beginning, to have given being to himself ; but there are millions of intelligent beings in the world who have recently come into existence : and the same has been true of every generation of their predecessors ; therefore their Creator must have been not only intelligent, but without beginning ; because nothing can go before the first thing, and the first cannot originate itself ; since that would make cause and effect to be the same thing, which is absurd. In agreement with this intuitive perception, the Bible teaches that God had no beginning ; *so far*, then, the Bible is true ; but the Christian religion is founded on the Bible ; *so far*, then, is that true, also.

8. Reason sees that if God be a supremely good cause, he can never originate a bad effect. He cannot then be the author of sin. Man being a sinner, and God being sinless, it is evident that at some time and somewhere man must have lost his integrity, and so become at variance with his Maker. But this is the very doctrine taught in the

Bible ; *so far*, then, is the Bible true ; but the Christian religion is founded upon the Bible ; *so far*, then, is that true also.

9. God being supremely good, it may be held as most probable that he would find out some way for man's restoration to happiness, without damage to any principle of law or government, if that were possible ; but what reason sees might be possible and probable, the Bible shows to be certain. Thus both are in agreement, but the Christian religion is founded on the Bible ; therefore it is also in agreement with reason on this point, and, *so far*, is true.

10. If it be supposable that God would find out a method of restoration, it is also supposable that he would make it known to those most interested in knowing it ; but this involves the possibility and probability of a *revclation*. Now what reason pronounces possible and probable, the Bible pronounces absolutely certain ; and reason cannot object in the face of sufficient proof. As it is clearly evident, by a world-wide experience and in the nature of the case, that man could never have found out the facts and doctrines specified in the Bible, it follows that the Bible must have been *inspired* ; since no other theory can account for it. This fact it claims as indubitably real, and since reason perceives that this fact alone will explain the nature of its contents, the Bible is *so far* true ; but the Christian religion is founded on the Bible ; therefore the Christian religion is, *so far*, true also.

Thus, in ten particulars, would the *à priori* reason naturally deal with the proposition above

laid down, without opening the Bible ; and by a fair deduction from first principles come to the conclusion that, by the balance of argument in their favor, the Bible and the religion founded upon it are probably true, at least to this extent : that unbelief involves a greater absurdity in fact, than the belief of them can involve by imputation, or by any amount of objections that have hitherto been rolled up by their enemies. How is it that they have not noticed these points at all, which seem self-suggestive to a fair mind, constructing an adverse argument by the *à priori* process? The omission proves, beyond question, that infidelity is a conspicuous failure. Take,

Second, another proposition, that *the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which is the kernel of revealed truth, beginning with the first promise after the fall of man, and fully expounded in the New Testament, is the hope of the world.* How would the *à priori* reason naturally deal with it? Beyond doubt, a fair judgment would demand that the New Testament, at least, should be read. The general impression as to its agreement with the fitness of things, its adaptedness to the wants of man, its tendency to promote the interests of his spiritual being, must arise from a candid investigation. Upon these and kindred points, the *à priori* reason would first seize as the foundation of an intelligent and just verdict ; and the following, or something analogous, would necessarily be the process of thought :

1. Does the Gospel represent God as an ignorant, variable, arbitrary, and unjust Being? If

so, the *à priori* reason must at once reject it as untrue, no matter what kind or amount of evidence may be offered in its favor. But the contrary is the precise fact. The descriptions of divine wisdom compassion and power, working for human welfare, perfectly accord with the intuitions of reason as to what, by natural apprehension, God should be both in his essence and attributes, and in his administration of government. The mind is satisfied with his revealed arrangements purposes and providences for the good of the universe. Nobody can find fault here.

2. Does the Gospel represent God with that grossness of nature with which Jupiter and other heathen divinities were clothed by their mythologies? If so, it must at once be rejected as an imposition; but the reverse is the exact truth. "God is a spirit," "God is light," "God is love." The sublimity and beauty of these scriptural definitions elicit the admiration and applause of all good men. Nobody can find fault here.

3. Does the Gospel prescribe a form of worship irreconcilable with reason or piety, or degrading to mind and heart? If so, it must be rejected as an abomination; but just the contrary is the precise fact. To be worshipped at all, God must be worshipped aright; to be worshipped aright, he must be worshipped "in spirit and in truth;" and to this reason responds with hearty approbation. Nobody can find fault here.

4. Does the Gospel fail to denounce iniquity; does it countenance injustice; does it tolerate impurity; does it confuse the mind on princi-

ples of right and wrong? If so, it must be rejected as at variance with the best interests of man; but the reverse is the precise fact. It condemns all iniquity, reprobates all dishonesty, applauds all virtue, and clearly discriminates between things that dignify and degrade human character. Truth as opposed to falsehood, justice as opposed to injustice, integrity as opposed to treachery, patience as opposed to passion, virtue as opposed to licentiousness, temperance as opposed to excess, sobriety as opposed to drunkenness, charity as opposed to selfishness, propriety as opposed to looseness, piety as opposed to irreligion, notoriously are set forth in the Gospel as the bright ornaments of a life acceptable to God; while the entire duty of man is summarized in a rule of universal application, and of marvellous comprehension: "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Did these principles prevail all over the world, even the infidel will acknowledge that earth would bloom perpetually with the growths of heaven. Nobody can find fault here.

5. Does the Gospel fail to enlighten men about the future, respecting which universal conscience is most anxious? Does it say that the present world limits human existence, or to live well is to make the most of sensuous enjoyment, since death is the last of us, and the grave the eternal home of the dead? Does it speak in Delphic oracles to the inquiring soul of man on this most important subject? If so, it would have little claim to his regard, and few would be found willing to choose

a faith so dismal. But the contrary is the precise fact in every particular. It declares this life to be preliminary to another, the nature of which shall be settled forever by a judgment to come, whereby the wrongs of this life shall be righted, and the great Arbiter of human destiny shall distribute it according to character. Nobody can find fault here.

Now it is clear that the *à priori* reason must pronounce these representations in keeping with the natural hopes and fears of the human mind; they are in agreement with its perception of the fitness of things; they are suited to its apprehensions of a just moral government; they are compatible with the eternal principles of moral rectitude; but they are peculiar to the Gospel—not being found in connection with any other system that ever bespoke for itself the confidence of men. How is it, I ask, that the champions of infidelity have paid no attention to these things in their *à priori* argument against revealed truth? Demonstrably they are the prominent points which should catch attention as quickly as the headlands of a continent arrest the eye of the mariner far out at sea; but not a sentence is devoted to explanation. On this point profound silence reigns. The omission is a fatal one, and therefore I say, again, the various efforts of infidelity have resulted in conspicuous failures during the whole progress of this time-worn debate.

But there are other matters demanding attention of still greater importance before the enemies of revealed truth are competent to con-

struct an argument of this kind. They relate to incontrovertible facts connected with the composition of the Gospels. It is a well-known fact that to play the part of a consistent liar is the most difficult task the shrewdest man can undertake. Should such a one present the world with an elaborate fiction purporting to be a truthful history, exact in statement, of the most exciting nature, adapted to arouse universal interest, and challenging investigation, he would have to deal in generals, cautiously avoiding particulars and every apparent discrepancy. Should he descend to the ordinary minuteness of time, place, and circumstance, inevitably he would be caught tripping somewhere, and would be sure of exposure by some one less shrewd perhaps than himself. Aware of the danger, he would most likely betray here and there some little anxiety to evade it; but the very caution, by its excess, would insure exposure. How much more readily would the *à priori* reason entrap the unskilled in this kind of work? It would be as great an impossibility for ignorance to baffle intelligence in its examination of such a performance, as for a blind man to pursue the calling of a civil engineer. Such is our conviction, and with this advantage we come to the perusal of the "Gospels," and "the Acts," written by *four* such men, ignorant, and of low calling in life, with one exception, and at different times and places, without concert of action, and many years *after* the events related had taken place. Thus we are in the best possible position for a speedy detection of fraud; and if it exist, it

can be infallibly made to appear as prominent as a mountain upon a plain.

We now open these books, and find in them the most astounding facts and events that ever happened, crowded together within a space short and comprehensive, and out of all proportion to their magnitude, judging by the ordinary rules and methods of composition. These books are not formal histories, but are put together, for the most part, as *memorabilia*, or annals, and for the most part unchronological in their details, relating the same facts, briefly, plainly, diversely but harmoniously, in a fourfold biography of their Master, by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Because their history, unlike any other, brings "glad tidings of great joy, which shall be for all people," as it is declared, each performance is called "THE GOSPEL" according to each of the respective authors, of whom we have the following accounts :

MATTHEW was a Jew, the son of a certain Alphaeus, residing at Capernaum, in Galilee ; and was well-known to its inhabitants ; for he held the office of collector of taxes under the government, and was at his post in the discharge of his duty when called by Christ. He immediately left his place and business, and followed him. This fact of his life must have been well-known to the taxpayers. He became an apostle.

MARK was also a Jew, the son of a certain Mary, residing at Jerusalem, and a woman of some little means. He might have been the young man referred to in his own gospel, Chap. 14, vs. 51, 52 ; and for that reason not named. He became the

companion of St. Paul, and afterwards of St. Peter.

LUKE was a Gentile, born at Antioch, educated a physician, became a proselyte to the Jewish religion, and then, after embracing Christianity, became a companion of St. Paul.

JOHN was a Jew, the son of Zebedee and Salome, residing at Capernaum, who with his father pursued the business of a fisherman upon the Lake of Galilee. He became an apostle.

Thus we have a better account of these persons than of any of the authors of the classics, whose works we accept without question. The matters of the Gospel were minutely known by thousands of witnesses, to whom LUKE thus refers in his preface: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as *they delivered them unto us*, which from the beginning were *eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word*, it seemed good to *me* also, *having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first*, to write unto thee, in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the *certainty* of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." Besides, their works have been quoted by a long succession of Christian and non-Christian authors, from their own time until the present, far more frequently than the accredited histories of Xenophon or Livy, or any other ancient historian. Thus much for authorship. Now, after diligent inspection and collation, what do we find?

1. From beginning to end of each book, we find

them absolutely teeming with particulars out of all proportion, as men generally write, to the space occupied in relating them; particulars of fact reference and description, pertaining to circumstances, times, places, names, localities, public affairs and private concerns, all within the period of well-known history, and involving a goodly number of facilities for testing the truth of their narratives so ready at hand, that any one of ordinary capacity can now turn critic at once, and be competent to the task. Beyond doubt, at first blush, seeming discrepancies, in a few instances, will stagger him; but with these facilities he will see that discrepancies upon the surface can be reconciled by harmonies beneath it, which a little patience will surely bring up among them; and that it could not well be otherwise in such pregnant brevity. Moreover, they are few in comparison with a multitude of facts boldly uttered and confidently referred to the common knowledge of all men then living within the localities spoken of. An illustration is at hand. Four artists, stationed at the east, west, north, and south of a few neighboring houses, take the entire group, with surroundings, at different hours of the day. In their pictures there would necessarily be diversity of light and shade, as well as transposition of objects, so marked that great differences would at once be seen. On the face of them there is little or no harmony, but when the artists explain that circumstantial variation is perfectly compatible with substantial agreement, all difficulty in identification of the same subject in the four pictures instantly

vanishes. So of the Gospels. On their face there is not absolute harmony. It was not designed ; but when one comes to understand that each of these authors wrote from a different stand-point, explaining his position with regard to the common subject, all is plain. Substantial agreement and circumstantial variation unite in proving the harmony of these four narratives, no less than the beauty in each peculiar to itself. So that these very discrepancies vanish into circumstantial proof of the integrity of the authors.

Now, *à priori* reason says, this is just as it should be in any fourfold history, such as that here under her eye, as proven by the collation of any four histories of Greece or Rome. No human contrivance, thus put forth, could possibly prevail in making fiction and forgery to be universally accepted as fact and truth for any length of time, much less for the period of nearly two thousand years of conflict, during which the Gospel has outlived all opposing forces. Thus far, then, the laws of evidence, and that by which *à priori* reason is governed, seem to stamp the whole with the unmistakable seal of truth. No man can deny it. No one, actuated by honesty and candor, can question that here is at least a degree of probability so high in favor of the absolute truth of the Gospel, that it demands to be explained away by all who oppose themselves. How is it, then, that our infidel authors who have attempted to write down the Gospel, or those who offer their sneers in lieu of better stuff, are profoundly silent on this point so vital to the legitimate construction of an *à priori*

argument? In all other historical investigations, such particulars as I have mentioned are regarded as sure stepping-stones to the discovery of truth. How comes it, then, that the Gospel documents are refused the benefits that learned infidelity fully accords to all others of far less importance by common consent? There can be but one answer.

2. The next and most important matter that arrests attention is the central theme of the Gospel—the Hero of the story, JESUS CHRIST OF NAZARETH. In all the world, has any character like his ever before or since attracted the eyes of men? Is it, in any of its aspects, like the best characters of Grecian or Roman story? Is it, in any thing, similar to those which descriptive talent has given to the heroes of tragedy or romance? Is it at all in keeping with any the world has been accustomed to look upon and applaud? Does it even accord in any one particular with the world's best specimens of goodness and virtue? Some have ventured to single out Socrates from among the old heathen worthies. Let Rousseau's answer, on a previous page, be recalled. Every man must say, No. Here we find a portrait the very reverse of human likeness, except in outward form; a character too noble, too sublime for any mortal mind of that or any other age to *invent*. Its excellence is so absolutely perfect, that to mend it is to mar it. Clearly it belongs not only to a real being, but to an *original* being, the like of whom never existed among men. This circumstance alone makes the gospel history of unrivalled in-

terest, and naturally subjects it to the severest possible test. It challenges the wit of man to investigation. We fail to receive the full impression it ought to make upon us, because we have been familiar with it from childhood ; but, divesting ourselves as far as we can of prepossessions, when we take a fair comprehensive view of the history of Jesus Christ, we must see that it stands more completely apart from all other biographies, than the sun in its vertical brightness from the hosts of stars hidden by his rays. We can imagine other suns like ours around which planets lay their courses, but we cannot think of another Jesus, nor of another history like his. We read, in the beginning of our sacred volume and in connection with the great calamity of the fall, the promise of God, that the *seed of the woman* should bruise the serpent's head. Four thousand years elapse, filled with the melancholy results of sin. Then Jesus of Nazareth appears. He comes into the world as no other ever did. Though *born*, he is *made of a woman* ; though free from sin, he is "made under the law" which holds all men without exception under a common condemnation. The wonders attending his birth find no parallel in human history. Nor is it much less wonderful that a being, whose birth was attended with such august manifestations, amidst the humblest circumstances, instead of growing up to early distinction, power, and renown, should absolutely sink out of sight for the first thirty years of his life. Nothing like this, in fact or fiction, is to be found in the annals of the world. At the end of

that time, he suddenly comes out of obscurity, and from a district of country proverbial for ignorance and barbarity. He had never learned. Watch now his steps, and scan his conduct from day to day. He pays no regard to riches, honors, or fame, but is ever found among the lowly ; yet he opens up a public life of but three years' continuance, or a little more, which for astounding results has never been approached by the greatest of men of the longest life and most numerous advantages. Wonders of godlike achievement, wisdom of godlike quality, attend him ; an unostentatious benefactor to all, without fee or reward ; a stranger to ambition, and by choice a companion of the poor. Nothing of this kind has ever been known to mark the conduct of the world's great men, who have been embalmed in its admiration. Follow him in his wearisome journeys, and witness the displays of his wisdom, and his unselfish converse with men. He undertakes the moral transformation of the race. He purifies the whole body of moral science. He utters maxims that cast into the deepest shade the loftiest sayings of philosophy. He presents an unfaltering example of the noblest virtue—thus illustrating every precept that fell from his lips. He devotes himself to the great business of reclaiming the world, not by his *life*, as we would naturally expect, but by his *death*, of which we should never have dreamed. For this purpose he *foretells* it shall be accomplished by violent means. Living without offence, laboring without reward, suffering without complaint, he has arraigned against him implacable

enemies, whose burning hate is fired by their own ill-concealed malevolence of heart, whose skill is exhausted to betray him into some indiscretion, but who always come off second best in every attempt. His loving soul steadily directs his hand in wonderful sanative power for the relief of the afflicted; his innocence of guile and fortitude of purpose conduct him through sore privations and baffled plots, spotless as the un-fallen snow. Envy itself cannot find a flaw in his character, nor a plausible excuse for defamation. In every difficult position he is forced to take by "the contradiction of sinners," he maintains the most dignified decorum, while managing his own cause with consummate skill. His penetration into the constitution of our moral being places him, in solitary majesty, far above all earthly sages, the anatomist of the human heart. The depth of his knowledge, the simplicity and sublimity of its utterance, the comprehensiveness of his thoughts, their coherence in showing the purity of his doctrine, extorted from soldiers sent to apprehend him this testimony, given by way of excuse for not doing it: "Never man spake as this man!"

These words of unparalleled wisdom, these instructions of weightiest import, these works of benevolence in a life of love, we have in the simple narratives of the Gospel; and every man can judge for himself. If they did not come from Jesus Christ, how did they get into that book, and whence did they come? If they did come from him, how is it that the *à priori* argument of infi-

delity fails to show how such a wonderful character can belong to a bad man? For bad man he surely was, if Jesus Christ was an impostor. If he was only a man, he was the *worst* man that ever lived, because he claimed *equality* with God, and made himself the most enduring idol, and his system the most destructive form of idolatry the world ever saw. If he was a *good* man, he must have been God as well; because incapable of blasphemy so hideous as that for which the Jews "took up stones to stone him;" and because his miracles were divine attestations to the truth of his claim, since they were clearly such as none but God could do; if he was a *good* man, then he was the Messiah; if the Messiah, then he was foretold in numerous prophecies found in the Old Testament; and that proves the Bible to be the casket of revealed truth. So urgent are these things upon the attention of the infidel, that a satisfactory account of them must be made before he can be entitled to a hearing, before his objections can find a spot to stand upon; but no such account has ever been given, hence the *à priori* argument of infidelity by its glaring omissions becomes a conspicuous failure.

That a life spent in doing good continually, and never discolored by a stain, should be ended upon a gibbet with the worst of criminals deserving such a fate, is not a little surprising. Jesus Christ could make this appeal to his enemies: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" and they were as dumb as the dead. But, unfaltering in their purpose, a company of Jewish priests and rulers,

led by a traitor who was familiar with Christ's little company, of whom he was one, with a band of soldiers finally go by night to capture him. Notwithstanding it was full moon, they take *lanterns* as well as weapons to insure the success of their project. They soon find him, and are themselves surprised by being mysteriously smitten to the ground with a word from his mouth, and then by a voluntary surrender of himself to their will. They hurry him through the mockery of a trial, before the dawn of day, and *condemn* him to death for blasphemy, without evidence; but, unable to carry out their own wicked verdict, because deprived of the power to inflict capital punishment, they hurry him to another trial in a Roman court upon another charge—the charge of *treason*—where he is tried and *acquitted*. Stung into madness, they make demonstrations so furious as to induce the cowardly judge to surrender the prisoner to death, for a crime not recognized by Roman law—a most remarkable combination of circumstances, for which, however, no explanation is given. Jesus was superior to all others in his life; so he surpassed all others in his death. Amid the tortures of a Roman penalty for no crime by Roman law, when nailed to the cross, instead of the complaints of injured innocence and outcries against the cruelest outrage, a wondrous prayer for the poor wretches is heard from his lips, amidst the strokes of the hammer: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Such another scene was never witnessed in this sin-cursed world, much less could it ever

have been contrived by any imagination schooled in an age when revenge was held to be a virtue.

Now, *à priori* reason would naturally ask: How came it that men of no culture, emerging from the dark realm of ignorance, could conceive such a character; or how was it possible for them to write their narratives in such a way as to force all intelligent readers to the conviction that they have before them the most wonderful history? Except upon the supposition that they relate nothing but genuine fact, their narratives are absolutely unaccountable; for no man, or set of men, especially such men, could ever be able to fabricate any thing like them. This is so clearly self-evident that it will not bear an attempt at proof. It is human to err; no one, therefore, could hope for credit should he run counter to human nature in description of character. Should any one attempt it, with no better model for general guidance than the best of men could furnish, he would be sure to fail. How much, then, is the difficulty increased, when four attempt the same thing, each independent of the others, and at periods variously distant from the time when the subject of their common biography was removed from the earth; and how much more difficult when that character must be the *incarnation* of Godhead, and the writers Galilean fishermen? Yet here we have it by just such authors! They tell a plain, unvarnished story, with all the incidents above referred to, involving the greatest apparent necessity for explanation without betraying any anxiety about the truth of their story, and without attempting

to explain such strange things as, for example, the success of Jesus in whipping the money-changers out of the temple, after overturning their tables, without meeting resistance. Other matters, equally strange, are also recorded, that ordinary writers would be sure to accompany by explanatory clauses for the sake of greater verisimilitude, but the language of the Evangelists have no such clauses. It is surprisingly calm, stating, in the briefest terms, the most astounding things, just as if relating the ordinary affairs of everyday life. We find no expressions of surprise, no pompous announcements, no studied arrangements, no declamation, no fondness for multiplying marvellous things, no explanations of apparent difficulties; and as the writers go artlessly on with their story, they state their own faults, as parts of it, without any attempt at concealment, even in disgraceful conduct. Pure unadorned nature, without a trope, is seen in every paragraph. Now here is a method of writing, common to them all, nowhere else found in any ordinary author, and is a point demanding special notice. Do we find authors of their time, or of any other time, marked by their peculiarities of style or diction? Do we find a single one, the Old Testament writers excepted, setting forth exciting and tragical events without some signs of emotion, or some little expression of opinion and feeling with regard to them? Do other authors, of any age, whose works have come down to us, express themselves, like our Evangelists, as if under oath in a court of justice, adhering strictly to matters of fact, without a sin-

gle comment? If not, then why are these authors so purely exceptional in their mode of diction? What can account for the restraint upon their pens, so utterly unfelt by all others? Surely there never was such a history, not only, but there never was such a writing of history since the world began. Is it, then, credible that such men as our evangelists are known to have been could have invented such a character, and could have forged such a history as their respective Gospels contain? There can be but one answer. Admit that the Gospels are genuine, it must be admitted that the writers depict their Master from life. Say that the reputed authors were incompetent to the task: much less, it must be said, could any others, subsequent to their time, have accomplished it. In any case, these documents are no less wonderful on account of their authorship than for their contents. Now their existence is a fact which must be satisfactorily accounted for. Suppose two men of our own day, brought up to the fisherman's calling, should abandon their nets, and, to improve their condition, should set about the writing of novels, how would they succeed? Need I ask? To say the least, their stories would smell of their fish, and they would soon discover it the better policy to return to their tackle and smacks. Can it then be reasonably supposed that such writers of the earliest age in Christian chronology, with no advantages whatever, could not only succeed better, but actually eclipse the most gifted that ever wrote in any age; and by their simply formed works of fiction, multiplied and still multiplying

by millions of copies, could have set in motion, and could have kept in progress for nearly two thousand years, a revolution that first swept the Roman Empire within four hundred years, and since has swept the world? A more preposterous supposition could not disgrace the brains of an idiot. But the brief works of our evangelists have actually done this very thing, and now are floating upon the popular tide more triumphantly than ever, translated in every language and extending into every clime.

The first question now to be settled by the *à priori* reason of infidelity includes a settlement of this point: How did these naturally incompetent authors write such a wonderful history, and how has it accomplished such a wonderful revolution? Undeniably, here is a mighty moral miracle, the effects of which all men know by their own experience. No man can deny it. The Gospels themselves have predicted their own success, which is now confessedly great, but yet to be realized in a far greater degree, beyond the experience of our own age; and if any now dispute their claim, they are bound to support all opposition by explaining this moral miracle to the satisfaction of the common-sense of mankind, or accept the doctrine of their inspiration and diffusion by divine efficiency. This is the alternative now set before the champions of infidelity; yet they decline to explain the facts of the documents, on the one hand, and to accept the doctrine, on the other. Whether the accredited evangelists be or be not the authors of these documents, the

facts of their existence, contents, and influence are still the same, and must be accounted for by gainsayers. Why have these points been ignored? There can be but one answer. Infidelity exhibits a failure in the field of argument, as great as its falsehood in the field of morals.

3. The religion of Jesus Christ is altogether *original*, and totally different from every other system that has obtained currency in the world. Every intelligent man knows this. It is a religion based upon *facts*, and not upon opinions. It is the outgrowth of principles long familiar to the Hebrew mind, but to no other class of mind at or since the days of Moses who wrote of Christ. He endorsed Moses and the whole of the Old Testament, whose religious significance was salvation through himself, as "the Lamb of God slain from before the foundation of the world," typified by the imposing service of the Hebrew ritual. Thus he spoke to certain disciples who bewailed their disappointment by the calamity of the crucifixion: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken; ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?" And to the Apostles, just before he left the world: "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." The meaning of that ritual, then, was "Christ and him crucified." Take away this fact and the whole fabric falls into ruins, like a house blown from its foundation by an explosion of dynamite. The

scriptures of the Old Testament, of which those of the New are the flowering and the fruitage, he held to be revealed truth, recognizing all its facts to be true facts just as they are recorded; the written moral law to be the divine standard of right and wrong; and the doctrines contained in them as the true principles of sound religious belief, needing only the expositions and illustrations of the Messiah, who came not to destroy "the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them." His religion, therefore, has been in the world from the beginning, divided into two dispensations, the ante-Messianic and the post-Messianic, but essentially the same; original in its plan, doctrine, and adaptation, and in all these particulars wonderfully comprehensive.

(1.) It is original in its plan. Go among all the nations that have been and are now upon earth, where can you find any thing like it? Observe the nature and tendency of their beliefs and worship. Their respective religions are based upon opinions designed to control distinctive communities; hence they are local in their influences, united with secular government for political purposes, and for nothing else. But the Christian religion is planned for the whole human race, and is meant to be general, emancipating men from the grasp of spiritual despotism, and at the same time making them more efficient for political duties, by the infusion of principles which bind the human conscience to the law of God and set it free from guilt by faith in a Saviour who "died, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."

(2.) It is original in its doctrines, all of which are founded upon facts and principles of which other religious systems are wholly destitute. They are mainly as follows:

[1.] It teaches the being, attributes and providence of a *personal* God, in whose *unity* there is a *triplicity*, distinguished by names and personal pronouns; who, having created, governs the universe—being everywhere present, knowing all things, and upholding all things, at every instant of time.

[2.] It teaches that the human race is totally depraved—having descended from and inherited the moral corruption of an apostate representative parentage—and is, therefore, under the condemnation of moral law, without help from its own resources, and without hope from any superior order of created intelligences.

[3.] It teaches that the love of God devised, and the power of God executed, the only plan of a plenary and perfect recovery for all who will accept the gospel of grace, relying solely upon the vicarious atonement of a Saviour, through whom mercy is thus made to flow to the guilty.

[4.] It teaches that this Saviour is an original being, uniting godhead and manhood in one personality, that, as a competent mediator, he might be *equal* to both parties between whom he mediates.

[5.] It teaches that all who come to God through Christ are regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit, whose office it is to glorify Christ and gather “out of the Gentiles a people for his name”—*Christians* in deed and in truth.

[6.] It teaches the resurrection of Christ, and the resurrection of all men from the grave, who shall appear before his judgment-seat at the grand assizes of the last day; a judgment to come; a heaven to be won, and a hell to be shunned, by those who have to this end yielded obedience to the Gospel.

[7.] It teaches that Christ is personally to come back to this earth, to reign and rule, recovering it from the dominion of evil and establishing "a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed;" that this "kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all (other) kingdoms, and it shall stand forever" in their place and room; and that "the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." (Dan., chap. vii.)

Such is the frame of doctrine built upon a foundation of facts which constitutes the holy temple of revealed truth, the best boon of Heaven for the religious instruction and salvation of men. The originality of the facts, the sublimity of the doctrine, and the efficiency of the plan, with the practical duties thence arising for the moral improvement and eternal benefit of man, prove the science of revealed truth to be of all others the greatest, most comprehensive and most needful to the welfare of the human race. Now, the wonderful contrast between the matter and the lan-

guage of the Gospels shows that the marks of human authorship are not in them. No labored periods commensurate with dignity of sentiment, novelty of miracle, or profundity of truth are found in them. The writers seem to be alike reined in by the steady hand of a mysterious controlling power, so that their writings might wear an aspect that should ever distinguish them from all others of mere human authorship. Have the sacred books of other religions, let me ask, ever ventured upon a definition of God? Have any of them ever declared the unpardonable nature of sin or declared forgiveness to be a cardinal grace in man? Whence then did this religion come? Could one of its facts or of its doctrines ever have been woven into a fabric of an all-comprehensive utility to mankind in the loom of human ingenuity? These are pertinent questions in the judgment of *à priori* reason; and since infidelity professedly argues itself out upon this line, its defenders are bound to answer them satisfactorily to common-sense. Why has there been no attempt in this direction? There can be but one answer. As to recent efforts, we believe that the modern sophistry of scientists shall meet with no better success than the old science of sophists, in their attacks upon revealed truth.

(3.) The Christian religion is original in its adaptation. Wherever it has gone over the globe, it has proved itself adequate to the spiritual and intellectual necessities of all kinds of men, irrespective of differences in race, climate, language, habit, or in any thing else that modifies social

life. Human nature is the same the world over. Evil actions everywhere proceed from evil thoughts, and no human law can reach them. The wretchedness of the world comes from the seething passions of the depraved heart, and no human power can quench the fire; but the religion of Christ alone has proved itself able to do this, wherever it has had a fair chance to operate. To this end the Holy Scriptures are adapted, and by the testimony of millions they reach it. Learned works are written for learned men, whose influence over others below them is relied upon by the world's reformers for controlling human affairs. It would be absurd to put a book like Hamilton's Lectures on Logic in the hands of an illiterate man, and equally foolish to offer a common-school book to a philosopher; but the Holy Scriptures are adapted to all classes of mind, from that of the child to that of the wisest of men. The theory of religion found in them is adapted to the spiritual and moral wants of the human race. The writers are better known to us than the authors of ancient histories or of philosophies, whose works have always been accredited to them by name without dispute; and in the face of this fact, it is in vain to call in question the personal histories of our evangelists for the purpose of discrediting the Gospels. Now, the *à priori* reason must ask: *Where did this history and this theory come from?* Is it possible that the base-born, the low-bred and illiterate, could have invented it? Why has infidelity overlooked this matter? There can be but one answer.

The *à priori* argument, correctly conducted to the fair disposition of such points as I have mentioned, and upon which the infidel is so profoundly silent, rolls up an amount of internal evidence from the Scriptures themselves absolutely overwhelming. The pretence that it goes all the other way, in the face of omissions above indicated, is a gross absurdity and an amazing impertinence, because an attempt to palm off the baldest fallacy upon the common-sense of the world.

LECTURE II.

REVEALED TRUTH.

THE. À POSTERIORI ARGUMENT.

Facts to be proved *à posteriori*—Nature of the argument—Prophecy—Pentateuch—Greenleaf's "Testimony of the Evangelists" commended—Legal Rules of Evidence—Prophecy and fulfilment a standing miracle—Fulfilment in spite of millions of chances against it an overwhelming argument—Prophecies of the Messiah—A dilemma—How the fulfilment of prophecy is proof of a doctrine—Prophecies uttered by Christ and their fulfilment—Eusebius's comparison between Evangelists and Josephus—Two ends gained by Prophecy—Miracles—Infidel arguments retorted—Gospel miracles such as none but God could do—Illustration—Egyptian miracles—The credentials of Revealed Truth early given, and continued to the end—Miracles of Christ classified—Proof of their performance tested by legal rules of evidence—Hume's argument—They imply no suspension of the laws of nature—Two objects gained by the miracles of Christ—The possibility of Revealed Truth fatal to the force of infidel arguments.

IF it be proved that God has spoken to man at *any* time and in *any* manner, it will not be doubted that he may have spoken to him at "sundry times and in divers manners;" and such communications will be readily admitted as revealed truth; by which is meant a class of facts, not discoverable

by the human mind, underlying a class of doctrines supernaturally taught as necessary to the present, prospective, and permanent welfare of our race. Nor can it be reasonably doubted that natural ignorance and absolute dependence show how much man needs revealed truth, for the goodness of God on the one hand, and the necessities of man on the other, will be seen by intuition and felt by consciousness of want, to be the *made* ground of all moral certainty attainable in this matter. If it be shown that these facts and doctrines are adapted to the intellectual and moral nature of man, it will at the same time become obvious that it is necessary they should be made known to him, that they should be confidently believed by him, and that to this end they should be adequately attested by such evidence as all men rely upon for the reality of things. This being made clear, we have really come to the end of all debate; for a supposable rational counter-belief, in the face of such proof, would either reduce the reason to insanity, or the mind, in all its emotions, to a state of moral distraction, and is therefore plainly absurd.

Every man, made a Christian by the power of revealed truth upon his own heart, has the witness in himself; and although it removes all doubt from him, it cannot be made by a mere statement to do the same service for others; hence he must establish the truth of his facts and doctrines by arguments which the common-sense of mankind will allow, and respecting which the experience of one man cannot be opposed to the experience of another. Hitherto I have confined myself to

the *à priori* argument, which is independent of all experience and observation, to show, first, the fallacy of the infidel in his way of conducting it; and, secondly, that when properly unfolded, from the working of the mind with abstract thought, it is most powerfully upon the side of revealed truth. From the force of circumstances, the nature of things, and the laws of mind, that argumentative process shows that the Gospel of Jesus Christ, while it teaches wonderful things, does not teach inconsistencies; it shows that the very existence of the Gospel is inexplicable on any other supposition than that of its heavenly origin; and that, regarding it as a mere human performance, it is seen to be girt about with self-evident impossibility, asserting a mightier miracle than has ever been witnessed since the world began. In the nature of things, the Gospel cannot exist unless it be true; but it does exist, therefore it is true.

In what I shall have to say of the Scriptures, I shall mainly confine my references to the five historical books of the Evangelists, and the five books of Moses, commonly called the Pentateuch, and for this reason: The science of revealed truth, like every other science, is built upon *a foundation of facts*; and because no other but the Christian religion can say this, no other religion can claim connection with science. These books contain all the facts in the case, which, if shown to be indubitably true, just as all other historical facts are proven, infidelity will be left speechless, though it may long gibber like a drunken man.

Supposing the *facts* of our volume to be as represented, the doctrines built upon them are unquestionably true; but their *reality* can only be laid bare by *testimony* which the *à posteriori* argument must furnish. That is dependent both upon observation and experience. Now if this testimony be such as will establish any fact in civil courts, it ought to satisfy every man; but if it be *more* than this, if it be such as *none but God could give, in addition to all that man can give*, there must be an end of the matter, and infidelity is bound to account for all these facts, proven to be true, before it can support a contradiction; it must show this testimony of God and man to be false, before it can justify unbelief; and if it do neither, as it has not yet done, it must prove itself at once an implacable enemy to both.

I need hardly say that the *à posteriori* argument is directly the reverse process of the one already considered. It proceeds by observation, backwards, from plain matters of fact to those more recondite, and so on to the discovery of hidden causes; and when its results come out in confirmation of those arrived at by the *à priori* process, probability becomes moral certainty. It cannot be otherwise, because the assurance of *reasoning* thus gained is just as reliable for the certainty of truth as is the assurance of *reason* for its own existence. The argument, in brief, is this:

The existence and power of God, as the first cause of all things, being granted, the facts declared to have been done by him, if proved to be such as none but God could do, prove the doc-

trines thereby attested to be infallibly true. Beginning with the date of four thousand years before Christ, the Old Testament reveals the facts of the creation, of the fall of man, and the promise of his recovery by *the seed of the woman*. This is the mother-promise and the mother-prophecy; all others subsequently issuing from human lips throughout this period were suspended upon it. Some of them were to be fulfilled before, some at, and some after the appearance of the great Deliverer. All these are contained in the sacred books of an early and peculiar people, existing down to the present day, preserved as no other nation has ever been preserved, and holding these books as a peculiar heritage, more sacred in their regard than life itself. The fulfilment of all of them was to be the unanswerable proof that this Deliverer, indicated in the mother-promise aforesaid, was no other than JESUS CHRIST, born in Bethlehem of Judea, under the reign of Augustus Cæsar. The New Testament, which is the complement of the Old, contains the wonderful history of the birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, attested by stupendous miracles wrought by himself continuously, for more than three years, in the face of day and of multitudes, including enemies who at the time, and sore against their will, admitted them to be real facts, just as related. These were followed by another series of miracles, wrought in his name for a long time after he had left the earth by those whom he qualified to work them, and whom he commissioned to teach his system of doctrine, in confirmation of which miracles

were continued until the evidence of revealed truth was so thoroughly established that nothing against it should ever be able to prevail. The *à posteriori* argument compares the alleged facts of fulfilment with the facts of prediction, as it goes back from effect to cause.

The evidence of revealed truth is such as none but God could give. This falls under the heads of prophecy and miracle.

I. PROPHECY.—New Testament facts are largely the fulfilments of Old Testament prophecy, covering a period of four thousand years. These fulfilments, like image and object in photography, so exactly correspond, that, in order to get rid of the forcible proof, infidels have exhausted their ingenuity in the effort of showing that the Old Testament was forged, to give credibility to the New! This is so utterly preposterous that nothing but the maliciousness of the charge can equal its stupidity. Had the Jews been friendly to Christ, and at one with him in a common interest, there might have been some color for this pretext, though not a particle of hope in making it good; but, instead, they were his bitter enemies; and so strong was it, that their enmity has flowed with their blood down through their descendants, unabated, to this day. So far did they carry their malice that, on account of the argumentative power in favor of the Messiahship of Christ which the early Christians derived from the prophecy of Daniel, they degraded that book from the high position it held among their prophetic books to a lower one in another division

of their scriptures called the Hagiographa, or sacred writings. They dared not to mutilate the Sacred Canon, but they did all they dared, with a hearty good will, to destroy the force of the Christians' argument from prophecy. They would indeed have had no remorse for forging any amount of lies against Christ and Christianity, but they would rather die than admit a single sentence of their sacred books to be a forgery. In this matter all their history proves they can be trusted to any extent. But the fact is, we are not dependent upon Jewish fidelity at all. It is well known that the Old Testament was translated into Greek two hundred and eighty-seven years before Christ was born, and scattered all over the world wherever Jews were found. This translation was read in every synagogue, and commonly used by the Jewish people at the time of the birth of Christ, and for a long time after, and is at this day widely circulated as an important help to the exposition of the Word of God. Now, in this translation, which is a fair rendering of the original, all the prophecies are found; therefore the absurd plea of forgery betrays a worse feeling than that of weakness on the part of all who venture it. This is circumstantial evidence keen enough to cut every sinew of the infidel argument, if it ever had any, that Old Testament prophecies were written subsequent to the events alleged as their fulfilment.

To make certainty doubly sure, however, the antiquity of the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses, is attested by a most singular fact. It will

be remembered that Nehemiah was appointed by the King of Persia to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. In this great work he was opposed by Sanballat, governor of Samaria, but in vain. Nehemiah completed the work, and made regulations for the people under his charge. Some of them were so highly offensive to Manasseh, son-in-law to Sanballat, that he retired into Samaria and became the founder of a religious sect implacably hostile to the Jews, arrogating to themselves the honor of being the only true Israelites. Manasseh built a temple to the God of Israel on Mount Gerizzim, and provided his converts with the five books of Moses, as their rule of faith, concealing the later books, lest the respectful allusions made in them to the sanctity of Jerusalem should disparage his own temple in Samaria. This schism took place many centuries before Christ, and produced a quarrel so violent that the common civilities of life were not extended by Jew to Samaritan, nor by Samaritan to Jew, though they dwelt together in the same land. However divided on all other matters, they were, nevertheless, perfectly united in a common veneration for the Pentateuch. For either of them to have corrupted it in the smallest particular was utterly impossible, because both parties had eyes of religious prejudice glaring upon each other. The singular fact above alluded to is this: In the beginning of the seventeenth century, after being unknown for a thousand years, copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch were found among the remnant that worshipped still at Gerizzim, and six

were purchased by Usher in the early part of it. "Thus we are brought to the conclusion that the Samaritan, as well as the Jewish copy, originally flowed from the autograph of Moses. The two constitute, in fact, *different recensions of the same work, and coalesce in point of history.*"

The Pentateuch contain a series of first facts and first things, followed by a system of moral and ceremonial laws which, by the authority of all history, were observed by the Israelites down to their dispersion among the nations of the earth. Other books of the Old Testament imply the previous existence of the five books of Moses; and throughout them all references are had to these facts and things, but more frequently to these laws as regulating the religion and civil polity of the Jews. The whole of the temple service was arranged by Solomon, a thousand years before Christ, according to the law of the Pentateuch; and at his advent all the books of the Old Testament, as we have them, were known throughout the world as the sacred books of the Jews. No intelligent infidel will deny this statement.

"The genuineness of these writings," says Dr. Greenleaf, an eminent lawyer, author, and Professor of Law in Harvard University, "really admits of as little doubt, and is susceptible of as ready proof, as that of any ancient writings whatever. The rule of municipal law on this subject is familiar, and applies with equal force to all ancient writings, whether documentary or otherwise; and as it comes first in order, in the prosecution of these inquiries, it may, for the sake of mere convenience, be designated as our first rule" (of evidence).

"Every document, apparently ancient, coming from the proper re-

pository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine, and devolves on the opposing party the burden of proving it otherwise."—(Testimony of the Evangelists, p. 7.)*

"If it be objected that the originals are lost, and that copies alone are now produced, the principles of the municipal law here also afford a satisfactory answer. For the multiplication of copies was a public fact, in the faithfulness of which all the Christian community had an interest; and it is a rule of law that

"In matters of public and general interest all persons must be presumed to be conversant with their own affairs."—p. 9.

Thus, it appears, the principles of civil law, common to every enlightened country, recognize the genuineness of our sacred books; and all the more, because they have sustained themselves against all manners of attack for ages, and are more multiplied now than ever before. How comes it that our infidel writers are so profoundly silent upon these points of law and fact; and how is it that such a marvellous history as that of the Bible, the like of which is nowhere found, receives no explanation at their hands going to show that it is not of so extraordinary a character as to justify the belief of supernatural preservation by a special providence? There can be but one answer. I claim that this point is forever settled upon the principles of common law.

In several passages of these books, God himself is represented as appealing to prophecy in proof of his own revealed truth. This challenge is an example: "Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the

* No minister's library is as well furnished as it should be, without this admirable volume.

King of Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and show us what shall happen: let them show the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods." Is. 41 : 21, 22. Now if God ever consented to reason with his intelligent but fallen creatures, to overcome their fears, remove their doubts, and win their confidence, and if no absurdity is involved, how natural is this appeal? How well adapted to prove, beyond all peradventure, the fact of a divine revelation? No one needs even a word to convince him that prediction of future certainties is alone within the power of Omniscience ; for if the wisest of men cannot assuredly tell on one day what shall take place on the next, of all the contingencies that may turn up, how much less able are they to show what shall occur beyond or within a hundred years, or even one? A prophecy, therefore, locating its own fulfilment hundreds of years ahead, or even one, must undeniably be, by the evidence of fulfilment, the utterance of God ; and is a standing miracle on the page of history, open to the inspection of all men. Whilst it *may* be said of miracles performed eighteen hundred years ago, that they are passed away and gone, and were to those that saw them in the first age of our era sensible proofs of revealed truth, it *must* be said of an old prophecy, whose fulfilment has passed into history, that it is thenceforth an omnipresent miracle to all intelligent minds in the world acquainted

with the record. Infidelity cannot deny it. Let us adduce just two examples: the predictions of the Pentateuch, compared with the present state of the Jews; and of Ezekiel, compared with the present state of Egypt. With regard to the Jews, their dispersion is in accordance with the prediction of Moses. (Deut. chs. 28-30.) Egypt was, perhaps, the very oldest, as it was the mightiest kingdom of the earth, long before the Jewish nation had an existence. The pyramids of Egypt are the monuments of its primitive greatness, and all history has borne, down to the present time, the varied record of its prolonged renown. Its civilization was the oldest, its line of kings the longest, its learning the greatest, its resources the richest, its population the largest, its territory the most productive, and its influence the most commanding of all the nations of antiquity; and yet in the face of this combination of apparently exhaustless strength and power and influence, the voice of prophecy was lifted up against Egypt, and thus it was written nearly six hundred years before Christ: "It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations." Ezek. 29: 15. "I will make the land waste, and all that is therein, by the hand of strangers: I the Lord have spoken it. There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt." Ezek. 30: 12, 13. The whole of this prophecy is very long and very minute, occupying four chapters, and the fulfilment was very remarkable. Egypt retained her greatness more than two hundred years after the prophecy had been uttered.

Three hundred and fifty years before Christ, the Persians subdued Egypt. Again it passed into the hands of other masters, and "was governed by the Ptolemies for the space of two hundred and ninety-four years, until, about thirty years before Christ, it became a province of the Roman empire." To this day it has continued in its fluctuating fortunes "the basest of the kingdoms;" and nothing is more wonderful than the accurate fulfilment of this prophecy, whose verification is still clearly manifest under the rule of the Turk.

All we have to do, then, is to fix the respective dates of a prophecy and its fulfilment in corresponding historical facts to complete an unanswerable argument. The process is a short one, and as conclusive as it is short. I need not stop to prove that in Old Testament history are found a number of predictions, great in age and variety, and minutely descriptive, all uttered by men professing themselves to be inspired of God. To show their honesty and confidence, they unhesitatingly appeal to the fulfilment of their predictions in the events spoken of, which should justify their extraordinary claims. Thus every thing was put out of their own hands, and referred to the decisions of supreme power. Nothing could be fairer, and although for the world at large it might take a long time to reach the fulness of proof, yet when reached it should be all the more powerful. These prophecies pertain to a great variety of things, some of them to events declared as sure to take place hundreds of years after the utterance of them. For example, there are cer-

tain predictions respecting the ancient and once magnificent city of Nineveh, in the book of Nahum, pronounced more than seven hundred years before Christ, and containing remarkable specifications as to the method of its destruction, which occurred after a lapse of one hundred and fifteen years from the time of their publication. Several historians give an account of its downfall, and the manner of it tallies exactly with the prophecy. The same is true of Tyre, the ancient emporium of the world. Isaiah announced its downfall in remarkable language, specifying such particulars as these: "I will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth her waves to come up, and they shall destroy the walls of Tyre, and break down her towers; I will scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock." "All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee; thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more." When these predictions were uttered, Tyre was in the full blaze of her glory, and so continued for at least one hundred and thirty years before the calamity came; and when it did come, these and other particulars contained in the prophecy became literal facts.

There are also numerous prophecies respecting the various fortunes of the Jewish people; prophecies declaring the birth and achievements of Cyrus, calling him by this name long before he was born; prophecies respecting the character and conduct of Alexander; prophecies of the destruction of Jerusalem and the disper-

sion of the Jews, with many others too numerous to mention and too minute for transcription here, whose descriptive phraseology will never admit of the supposition that they were fortunate guesses of the men who uttered them, and who staked their own character for veracity and piety upon the events that should occur in the history of the world long after themselves should be dead. It surely appears that God had a wonderful purpose to accomplish by a late fulfilment of early prophecy, in reserving for modern times the strongest argument for the reality of revealed truth to be unfolded in the riper ages of the world. We are in a condition with regard to historic development, and live in an age late enough to test these old prophets by their own criteria furnished for that purpose. We are fully prepared to prove that the events thus predicted in early ages so precisely correspond to the predictions as to time, place, circumstance, and personality, that no room is left for doubt as to this correspondence. For example: Expressly at the time fixed by the prophecy the Jews were carried by Nebuchadnezzar captive into Babylon, and remained in bondage during the predicted time of seventy years. Expressly at the time fixed by the prophecy Cyrus was born, was named, did perform the achievements predicted of him, and did rescue the Jews from the Babylonish yoke. Expressly at the time fixed by the prophecy Alexander the Great ascended the throne of Greece, conquered Persia and all the East, and visited the Temple of Jerusalem. Expressly at the time

fixed by the prophecy Jesus of Nazareth, the predicted Messiah, appeared, laid the foundation of Christianity and suffered the death of the cross. Expressly at the time fixed by the prophecy Jerusalem was destroyed by the Roman armies, and not one stone of the Temple left on another. Precisely according to prophecy the Jews, subsequent to this event, were scattered over all the earth, and were commingled, though not mixed, with all sorts of people, doomed to persecution and oppression in all lands, a hissing and a by-word among all nations. And as it was predicted that they should be kept a distinct people in their state of dispersion until regathered in their own land, so they have to this hour continued, for eighteen hundred years, a distinct people; just as much separated from Gentiles as they ever were; retaining their own laws, customs, and synagogue worship as they had them when they were driven out of their land by the punitive hand of God for their unparalleled iniquity. There never was such a preservation of a world-wide scattered people, yet remaining closely bound together, without a country, without a government, without any political bond of union, and resisting every thing like tendency to separation or absorption. They are the only nation on earth existing in solution, as no other ever did, whose nationality is as sharply defined and as distinctively preserved as it ever was. Wherever a Gentile sees a Jew, he sees a living, walking argument for the truth of the religion of Christ.

At the risk of prolixity, however, I shall briefly dispose of this argument of guesswork.

Infidels say that the prophets were impostors, and chance rules the world. Well, "suppose that there had been only *ten* men in ancient times who pretended to be prophets, each of whom exhibited only *five* independent criteria as to place, government, concomitant events, doctrine taught, character, sufferings, death, the meeting of all which in one person should prove the reality of their calling as prophets, and of his mission in the character they have assigned him; suppose, moreover, that all events were left to *chance* merely, and we were to compute, from the principle employed by mathematicians in the investigation of such subjects, the probability of these *fifty* independent circumstances happening *at all*. Assume that there is, according to the technical phrase, an *equal chance* for the happening or the failure of any one of the specified particulars; then the probability *against* the occurrence of all the particulars in *any* way, is that of the fiftieth power of two to unity; that is, the probability is greater than 1,125,000,000,000,000 to 1; or greater than *eleven hundred and twenty-five millions of millions to one, that all these circumstances do not turn up, even at distant periods*. This computation, however, is independent of the consideration of *time*. Let it then be recollected that if any one of the specified circumstances happen, it *may* be the day after the delivery of the prophecy, or at any period from that time to the end of the world, this will so indefinitely augment the probability against the contemporaneous occurrence of merely these *fifty* circumstances, that it surpasses the power of numbers to express

the immense improbability of its taking place at all ; how much greater the improbability when all events are under the control of a Being who controls all things and hates imposture ?" * According, then, to the infidel argument, the *ten* impostors could not have established their claim at all, whether there be a God or not ; but if a far greater number, with far more numerous criteria, all prophecy of the Messiahship of Christ, and all their predictions be demonstrably fulfilled in corresponding events, then these things will be fully established :—the existence of God, the fact of his general and special providence, and the absolute certainty of revealed truth. These are to be determined by well-established facts, to some of which let us pay attention.

The prophecy of Daniel relating to the first advent of Christ declares the time of it to be four hundred and ninety years from the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Now, any one can see that there were as many chances against an accidental fulfilment as there were other periods of time beside that fixed in the prophecy for the Saviour's birth ; but he actually came at the very time set by the prediction. Prophecies relating to the same event announce the country and the town in the country in which he should be born. This again swells the chances against an accidental fulfilment by the number of all the towns in the country, and of all the countries in the world where a great deliverer might possibly be born. Again, all these towns

* Gregory's Letters.

and countries must be multiplied by all the periods of time besides that in which Christ appeared, in order to get at the number of chances against an accidental fulfilment of the prediction. Very early in Old Testament history it was foretold not only that the promised deliverer should descend from the first parents of the race, but that he should be of the seed of Abraham. This increased the chances against an accidental fulfilment by all the men in the world contemporary with Abraham, from whom this deliverer might possibly come. As time rolled on the prophecy was limited to Isaac, excluding the other children of Abraham; then it was limited to Jacob, excluding the other children of Isaac; then again it was limited to Judah, excluding the other children of Jacob; then it was limited again to the family of David, excluding all other families in the tribe of Judah; then again it was limited to Solomon, excluding the other children of David; then again it was limited to Mary, excluding all other contemporary virgins of the line of Solomon. Now, with each of these limitations, a large number of chances against an accidental fulfilment was connected, and all these numbers must be made, in turn, multipliers to preceding amounts increased by each; so that the progression of chances against an accidental fulfilment with the lapse of time becomes absolutely incalculable. Failure in any one particular would have ruined the prophecy; but amid billions of chances for failure, the family records of the tribes of Israel, which they were obliged to keep by statute, prove,

to the confusion of the Jew and the infidel, that the prophecy came out exactly right, according to all its limitations, at the end of four thousand years! What now becomes of the argument for guess-work? Will any one, in the face of these facts, have the courage to plead it?

But this is not all. The very peculiar circumstances of life in which Christ should appear were also foretold long before his advent, some by one prophet, others by another, and so on in different periods of the age of revelation. Though descended from a king, this deliverer, according to prophecy, was to be "despised and rejected of men;" though of unparalleled majesty, he was to be of "a meek and lowly spirit;" though of no repute among men, he was to work miracles in giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, succor to the afflicted, comfort to the poor; though immaculately innocent, he was to be "numbered with transgressors." Then he was to be put to a cruel death, the exact form of which was foretold; his hands and feet were to be pierced, but none of his bones broken. His garments were to be distributed, his enemies to utter reproaches and taunts; they were to give him vinegar to drink. The very words he should utter upon the cross were recorded hundreds of years before he was born, the manner of his burial as well, and the success that should attend his cause through all subsequent time. These circumstances in the history of Christ, according to the tenor of human affairs, were most unlikely to occur to one of the royal house of David, who

was to be a great deliverer. I might take up each and show how unlikely it was to happen, because so seemingly in conflict with the natural course of things when viewed in the light of attending circumstances. Thus, for example, the prophecy says, "They appointed him his grave with the wicked, yet was he with the rich in his death." Is. 53 : 9. (Heb.) Answering thereto, it was a fact that though Jesus was crucified between two thieves, he was not buried with them, as intended by the Jewish rulers, but was the first that was laid in a new and costly tomb of a rich man. Matt. 27 : 60. How unlikely was this! yet it was brought about in the *sovereignty* of God by the most natural means, and with the utmost *freedom* of human action. These facts, accurately recorded, were never contradicted by early enemies, who most felt the necessity of proving them false, had such a thing been possible.

Now, the hastiest review will show us at a glance that the history of Christ was pre-written by several persons, who lived at long intervals of time during the age of revelation, each contributing a little ; but no two of them, in the nature of the case, could have had any intercourse with, or knowledge of each other. This age was a little more than four thousand years, but the time of *writing* was only about three-eighths of the period. The contributors to the Old Testament were men differing widely in ability, education, and social life. Thus, Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians ; David and Solomon were kings ; Daniel was a minister of state ; Ezra, Jeremiah, and

Ezekiel were priests ; Amos was a herdsman. David wrote some four hundred years after Moses, Isaiah about two hundred and fifty years after David ; Daniel about one hundred and fifty years after Isaiah ; Ezekiel about one hundred years after Daniel ; and Malachi about two hundred years after Ezekiel. Between Moses and John there was an interval of more than fifteen hundred years, during which the whole of revelation was made.

All the books of these authors were written amid the strangest diversity of time, place, and condition ; and in different forms of history, biography, laconics, poems, and prophecy ; yet there is an evident *unity* of design pervading the whole, which proves a *unity* of origin in some source not *within* the minds of the authors, but *without*, and so controlling each as to bring each man's thoughts to crystallize around the same thread extended through all these centuries, and especially with regard to Messiah, the Hope of Israel. How is all this to be explained ? Shall we say, it may be accounted for by the infidel's suggestion that the Old Testament was forged to give credibility to the New ? This is not only absurd in itself, but plainly impossible by the fact that the Old Testament was translated into Greek nearly three hundred years before the birth of Christ, in which the titles above referred to are all recorded, and when brought together make an anticipated biography of him wonderfully minute and distinct for an outline. The supposition of forgery is therefore a monstrosity in foolishness.

This question then pushes itself before us: How could such a variety of events be predicted by such a variety of men living amid such a variety of times and places, and not one of the predictions fail as proved by correspondent events? There can be but one answer that avoids all absurdity. Thus we are reduced to this dilemma, *Either the Christian religion is the truth of God, or God himself is the author of a horrible delusion.* There is no escape, for we have the books, and whoever will may search for himself.

Now, I contend that even one such prophecy as that in Isaiah 53, in its fulfilment, furnishes an unanswerable proof to the general fact of Revealed Truth, and to the specific truth of each *doctrine* in whose interest it was published. But here it may be questioned, how is the fulfilment of a prophecy the proof of a doctrine? I answer, the very object of the one is to beget confidence in the other. Take away this idea, and the whole body of prophecy becomes utterly insignificant, having the character of enigmas, apparently designed only for exciting the wonder of mankind; but when it is considered that doctrine needs proof in proportion to its importance, it will be seen that any doctrine claiming to come directly from God needs proof coming in a sure way, and from a sure source, independent of the laws of nature, and mounting above the capabilities of man. Astronomers foretell eclipses and the return of comets many years in advance, and when they appear men are apt to wonder at such predictions always coming true to a moment of

time ; but this is not prophecy, because the result of scientific calculation based upon a knowledge of the mechanism of the universe. Such predictions are only like those of an ordinary mechanic or machinist, who foretells what will come out of some complicate contrivance working in accordance with previously existing laws of motion. How different is this from the prediction of events that happen without any such dependence upon the established laws of nature, such as the birth, life, and death of an individual, which may or may not happen at certain specified times ; or the unfortunate end of a flourishing city or nation, when at the time of prediction all appearances and probabilities were against it? These things neither man nor angel can know, because neither of them is omniscient. Hence it is plain that the fulfilment of a prophecy is proof of the doctrine whose truth it was designed to establish.

Jesus Christ himself was truly held to be a prophet, mighty in word and deed, who proved his own claims by both. Of the Christian Church he said it should be founded upon a rock, and the powers of hell should not prevail against it, when as yet it had no distinctive existence. How now is this verified by the history intervening between his time and ours? Behold ! a vast continent not then discovered, all studded with the monuments of its glory. Here is a vast territory, of the existence of which no one for a long time after Christ ever dreamed, all under its mighty influence, whence issue perennial gospel streams to irrigate the world. Was there ever such a won-

derful fulfilment as this! Christ also predicted, in reference to the loving female disciple who bestowed upon him the fragrant contents of her alabaster box, that wheresoever the Gospel should be preached in the whole world, this little act of love demonstrative should be told for a memorial of her. How is it now and here? The name of Mary, associated with her box of ointment, is proclaimed from every pulpit. Will infidelity tell us this is all a fabrication?

Three of the Evangelists, who wrote before the sacking of Jerusalem by Titus, record the wonderfully minute prophecy of our Lord as to the ways and means of its destruction; and, true enough, it was accurately fulfilled some forty years after he uttered it, and as he uttered it. I need only say that Josephus, who was an eye-witness of that appalling calamity, so describes it as to make his own history unwittingly the most valuable exposition of the prophecy. Eusebius, who wrote two hundred and sixty years after him, says of it: "On comparing the declarations of our Saviour with the parts of the historian's work, where he describes the whole war, how can one fail to acknowledge and wonder at the truly divine and extraordinary foreknowledge and prediction of our Saviour?"—B. iii., ch. 7.

Now here is a multitude of historical facts, both of prediction and fulfilment, recorded in the book of Revealed Truth, as it claims to be, overlying the whole time from Adam to Christ, a period of four thousand years, all of which were designed and adapted to prove its claim to be a valid one.

It is just such proof as the nature of the case demands; just such proof as well comports with the nature of the claim set up; just such proof as none but God could give; and therefore just such proof as none but a malignant can resist. To meet it with the bare assertion of forgery or guess-work is clearly a confession of discomfiture. From this general view of the subject of prophecy it will appear that two great ends have been undeniably reached by it, namely, solid ground for expectation *before* Christ came, and solid ground for faith in him *after* he came.

(1.) Prophecy afforded solid ground for expectation to the whole nation of the Jews who waited for "the consolation of Israel." It will not be denied that for some time previous to the advent every individual of that nation, whether at home or abroad, was standing on the tiptoe of expectation with regard to it; and that, explain it as we may, the same feeling of expectation, though of a far more indefinite kind, largely pervaded the Gentile world. This expectation of the Messiah was well laid upon the divine origin and supernatural source of prophecy, the main feature of which was a medium between too great obscurity on the one hand, and too great precision on the other. The general impatience, however, hurried all of them into the mistake of overlooking prophecies relating to the *first* advent of Christ to suffer and die, and fixing all their heartfelt anxiety upon the speedy fulfilment of prophecies pertaining to his *second* advent to reign, and to advance their nation to the predicted dignity of which they read out of

the books of the prophets in their synagogues every Sabbath day. The Jewish people were not confined to the territory of Palestine at the time of the advent of Christ. Notwithstanding the permission by Cyrus to return to it after the predicted seventy years of captivity had ended, a large number remained in Babylon, being about as indifferent to the fatherland as are our Jews, who prefer to remain in the comfortable social condition they have ever enjoyed in the United States. Their condition in Babylon was much improved. Great privileges were granted them, and their colonies consequently became so numerous, and had been so well located for trade, that at the time of the advent there was no portion of the Roman empire where Jews were not found. Their religion and their sacred books became as widely known as themselves. But although Judaism was respected among the heathen as a religious system mainly for its antiquity, yet the Jews themselves were both hated and feared; for the political character with which they imprudently as well as falsely invested their coming Messiah, awakened the suspicions of the Roman officials, and kept them on the lookout for insurrections. Hence, when Herod heard of the visit of the Magi in search of him who had been born king of the Jews, he was much excited, and all Jerusalem with him, though on different grounds; and sending for the chief priests and other dignitaries, demanded of them where their Messiah should be born. How could they tell in any other way than by reference to prophecy? Accordingly, they submitted to

Herod for his own inspection, or at least recited to him the prophecy of Micah 5 : 2, uttered seven hundred years before its fulfilment in their own day : " But thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my people Israel." This, though substantially the same as the Hebrew in *sense*, is somewhat different in phraseology ; the explanation is that the Jews loosely quoted the Greek version to which I have already alluded, and probably had a copy with them out of which the king could read for himself. Thus, by their own showing, and at the expiration of the time appointed, as they believed, the Messiah came, " made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that are under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." This, however, for the reason above given, was not the faith of the Jews. The whole nation had long been misled by the false glosses of their teachers, and this explains the fact that when " he came to his own, his own received him not." Their expectation as to the *time* met with no disappointment ; but with respect to the object and manner of his coming, his character and his work, their great mistake was a fatal because a careless one, as above indicated.

(2.) Prophecy afforded solid ground for faith in the Messiah after he came. In proof of this I have only to refer to the occasion when John the Baptist sent messengers from the place of his imprisonment to Him, saying : " Art thou he who should come, or do we look for another?" Christ

returned the answer: "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." Reference was had to the acknowledged predicted *work* of the Messiah, by the performance of which he was to be known when he came. John had previously borne witness to him as the antitype of the Jewish piacular sacrifice, "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;" and now he was substantially told to base his confidence upon the evidence of his own disciples, spread out before their eyes as the credentials of the Messiah specified in prophecy. To this evidence Christ often referred all cavillers whose prejudices proved that they could be satisfied with no amount of evidence, because their ambitious views and carnal expectations were disappointed. For reasons not now necessary to specify, he never formally declared himself in public, as he did in private to the Samaritan woman. He preferred to let the point of Messiahship be first settled in the convictions of men forced to the conclusion by seeing the works wrought by his own hand, which the prophecy said should prove his wonderful character. How eminently wise was this, and how well calculated to carry conviction to honest minds,—“What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!” Previously none had ever claimed the august character of “Shiloh;” but in agreement with the prediction of Jesus, many,

subsequent to his ascension, taking advantage of the national expectation, set up the claim without justifying it in any way; and crowds who refused Christ, though well attested, madly ran after these impostors and miserably perished.

II. MIRACLES.—What is a miracle? It is a work performed by divine power counteracting the laws of nature in attestation of the fact and truth of revelation. Infidels, from the days of Hume down to the present, depending upon his often-refuted argument about experience, retail it as if original with each of themselves; and think they have made a successful stand in the assertion that “a miracle is an impossibility.” But opposite assertions are equally good or equally bad in the line of any debate; and as in all others, so in this, the use of an old exploded argument is only the evidence of ignorance or weakness upon the part of him who ventures to use it as fresh and available material. They all unite in saying what is not true, namely, that the laws of nature are invariable; they never change; consequently miracles can never occur: but this is assuming the very thing to be proved. By the testimony of an eminent physiologist, BICHAT, the laws of vitality do change, being variable in their influences and uncertain in their results. Thus he says, in his “Introduction to his General Anatomy,” p. 21: “The vital properties are at every instant undergoing some change in degree and kind; they are scarcely ever the same.” Again he says: “They are subject to a number of varieties; they frequently baffle all calculation, and would require as many formulæ as the cases which

occur. In their phenomena nothing can be foreseen, foretold, or calculated; we judge of them only by their analogies, and these are, in the vast proportion of instances, extremely uncertain." But the laws of vitality *belong* to the laws of nature. What then becomes of the infidel's assertion that the laws of nature never change? Perhaps now he will say the *physical* laws of matter never change. But here again he is begging the question. The laws of matter are not definable principles, but *general facts* of observation, by which we perceive that one thing always follows another, as cause and effect. Who does not know of the wonderful and inexplicable variety of atmospheric phenomena? When we speak of showers, we refer generally to showers of rain; but there are well-established facts of showers of stones, some out of clouds, and some when no clouds were to be seen; showers of dust, and showers of red infusoria, which in early times were called showers of blood. Rain is generally *limpid*, and snow is *white*; but there are instances on record of *black* rain and *luminous* rain; of *black* snow and *red* snow. Rain generally falls from clouds, but there are well-attested instances on record where copious showers have fallen without any clouds to be seen, but stars instead, in their usual appearance, shining brightly. Snow, when it falls, is of the same appearance; but its crystals vary in shape, with consecutive showers in the same day, it may be, from eight to ten varieties of form. Lightning is generally seen as zigzag or sheet lightning; but sometimes it is *arborescent*, taking the form of a tree

with its branches. Be sure, for *some* of these wonders explanations are offered, because there is no such thing as *denying* facts; but they are for the most part conjectural and unsatisfactory, as well as partial. Now we may ask, Do these phenomena apparently sustain, or apparently contradict the assertion that the laws of nature are always constant, regular, and unchangeable? Any one can decide for himself. Disbelief, then, founded on circumscribed experience, is both fallacious and absurd.

But, for the sake of argument, let us allow "that things contrary to experience ought not to be believed." What then? Why, according to this position, revealed truth, and Christianity, founded upon it, must be received as heaven's greatest boon; for example:

1. *It is contrary to all known experience* that men of low grade and of no culture can naturally produce literary works that shall outlive all cotemporary productions on ordinary subjects of discussion; but such have been the living works of the various writers, both of the Old and New Testaments, not on ordinary but on extraordinary subjects; therefore the assertions of infidels concerning them cannot consistently be believed.

2. *It is contrary to all known experience* that a record of facts and principles having abundance of proof to sustain it—such as is accepted in civil courts—should ever be regarded as false; but such is the record of revealed truth; therefore the assertions of infidels respecting it cannot consistently be believed.

3. *It is contrary to all known experience* that *bad* men should go about the world to reform *bad* men; but infidels say that the apostles were *bad* men; therefore their assertions are not to be believed.

4. *It is contrary to all known experience* that *good* men should go about the world practising *deception* to make *good* men; but infidels say that in their performances, called miracles, the apostles practised *deception*, while it is undeniable they taught the purest moral and religious sentiment; therefore the assertions of infidels respecting them are not to be believed.

5. *It is contrary to all known experience* that men should ever lay down their lives in attestation of a *false* fact; but the apostles laid down their lives in attestation of the resurrection of their Master from the dead; therefore the allegations of infidels against the doctrine of the resurrection are not to be believed.

6. *It is contrary to all known experience* that the religion of a whole nation, and that the largest in the world, should ever be overturned by the preaching of lies by a few ignorant men; but the religion of the Roman empire was overturned by the preaching of the primitive converts to Christ; therefore the assertions of infidelity are absurd and not to be believed.

7. *It is contrary to all known experience* that counterfeits should be ever issued of that which never had an existence; but counterfeit *miracles* have always been more or less thrust upon the attention and acceptance of men as genuine; there-

fore genuine miracles have been performed ; and the assertions of infidels, contrary to their own boasted axiom, and against a vast amount of testimony, both of *enemies* and friends, cannot consistently be believed. Thus, *by their own showing*, revealed truth, and the Christian religion founded upon it, should be accepted as the hope of the world.

Nicodemus, who was a master in Israel, and well acquainted with the evidence by which the presence of the Messiah should be known, was so impressed that he came to Christ with this language upon his lips: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." These miracles to which he referred, Christ himself on several occasions called "the works of God," and such was the belief of this Jewish Rabbi not only, but of many other considerate men whom his personal pronoun included. But what kind of works were they? Nothing can move without the concurrence of divine power, and in this sense all things are of God. Were they then such works as enlisted the co-operation of men? No; for in that case they could not have proved any thing in behalf of the character which some had inferred from them. Were they such works as left it inferrible that they were wrought by superior, but still human skill, to which ordinary men were incompetent? No; for in that case the discovery would have been fatal to the claim they were designed to sustain. They were such as no created being could of

himself perform, and necessarily so ; because when God sends special messengers to men, if he ever do, he must verify the fact by such credentials as shall compel acceptance ; and these, in the nature of the case, must be the performance of works *in the sight of men* such as none but God can do.

To illustrate this point, let us go back to Old Testament history. Moses was a divinely commissioned messenger sent to Pharaoh, king of Egypt. He appeared before the haughty monarch with this extraordinary information : " The God of the Hebrews hath sent me to thee, O Pharaoh, to demand the release of his people from that severe bondage in which thou hast enthralled them." The tyrant was superstitious, and from the boldness of the stranger probably thought it best to be cautious. Instead of seizing Moses and his more eloquent brother, and treating them with that indignity or violence which might have been expected from such a man, he thought proper to say in the outset something that might, as he would naturally think, quench their ardor. " If thou art a commissioner from heaven, give me some proof of thy authority." This was a reasonable requirement, and no sooner said than done. Aaron threw down his rod upon the ground, and it became a serpent. This was sufficiently startling, and reduced the king to a commendable degree of meekness ; but not trusting to his own bewildered wits, while anxious to discover whether this astonishing transformation was really an evidence of divine authority or the effect of magic, to

which he was superstitiously devoted, he speedily sent for his own trusted magicians, commanding them to attempt the same experiment. Without hesitancy they had to obey, though reluctant, from the knowledge that this was an original phenomenon, wholly baffling their skill. They threw down their rods, which, to their great astonishment, in like manner became serpents; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods before it regained its normal condition! This was ominous, and doubtless intimated to them the hoplessness of the contest into which they had been forced. But the effect was to relieve the mind of Pharaoh, and settled him in the belief that Moses and Aaron were expert magicians, who sought to make use of their art to frighten him into the indiscretion of liberating a people whom he was most anxious to retain; and he may be supposed to have dismissed them, with the intimation that he was quite too smart for them in this particular. At various times these men of God appeared before his majesty, making the same demand, with like results. They converted the water of the Nile into blood, so did the magicians; they produced a prodigious number of frogs, so did the magicians; they performed seven other miracles, no more difficult than the former; so did NOT the magicians; and therefore they informed their king that such marvellous things were beyond the artifice of human skill, and could only be done by divine power. They therefore gave their opinion in favor of the divine legation of Moses and his brother. This was the end to be gained in showing Pharaoh to be with-

out excuse, and to have taken the initiative in hardening his own heart.

As this is one of the difficult passages of Scripture, so called, it may not be amiss to attempt removing that absurdity which has been affixed to it by infidels, and the ridicule that has been drawn out by inadequate exposition. The first question here is this: Were the miracles of Moses and Aaron and those of the Egyptians of the same kind, or were the former genuine, while the latter were the effects of magic or the devil? The history is so plain upon the subject, that without any reasonable doubt they were all alike genuine, all alike the product of divine power. To maintain that the miracles of these servants of God were true, and those of the magicians false, all alike being designated in the narrative as real miracles without a hint to the contrary, is to throw the greatest advantage into the hands of the infidel, who finds in the Old Testament, as he thinks, an arsenal of weapons for swift destruction to the claims of Revealed Truth. It is to say that the character of the men determined the character of the miracles, and not God. It is to say that the magicians, by a mysterious influence of their art over the air, light, and organs of vision, deceived Pharaoh and the Egyptians, making them believe that they saw things which did not exist; it is to say, with the same breath, that they wrought no real miracle, and that they produced what was equal to the greatest of them; for it may be confidently referred to any man of common understanding, if a greater miracle could be supposed

than to convince the king and the whole nation of the Egyptians that they saw rods changed into serpents, water turned into blood, frogs covering the land, when no such thing took place; for all this was done by the magicians as well as by Moses. Such a supposition, if not regarded as absurd, must at least be seen to be dangerous to biblical exegesis; for an infidel wants nothing more to secure a triumph. He would argue, and that correctly, that if the magicians could so thoroughly deceive the king and the whole nation, why might not Moses also deceive them, since we are informed that he was skilled in all the learning of the Egyptians? The consequence of this would be that no respect is due to the testimony of our senses, and that every degree of evidence founded upon them may be disregarded as unreliable, because of this possibility of deception. Hence it can never be proved that any miracle was ever performed, because the appropriate source of all certain proof in the behalf of miracles is dried up forever. Such is the consequence of abandoning the plain words of Scripture and the laws of language to answer the demands of human opinion. Nothing, in my judgment, can be plainer than this, that the power by which these magicians did the same things done by Moses was the power of God, and for this plain reason, that their acts, no less than his, were *creative* acts, and therefore could not have been accomplished by the art of man or by the agency of the devil. To turn a rod into a living, crawling serpent, to give *animal* life to a dead substance that had been deprived of

another kind natural to it, namely, vegetable life, was a creative act, which none but God could do ; to convert the waters of a kingdom into blood, and to call a vast multitude of full-grown frogs into existence and activity in one night, are deeds which required no less a power than that which made the world. Works of creation come not within the power of man, angel, or devil ; for if ever such could be the case, a *creature* would become a *creator*, and one of the strongest proofs of the existence of a personal God would be blotted out forever. The contrary opinion, assigning the miracles of the magicians to the agency of the devil, is indefensible, not only because it gives an inalienable attribute of the Almighty to the devil, but for another reason. If the magicians worked by the energy of Satan, it is perfectly evident that when they gave up the contest, saying that they could not imitate any of the other seven miracles performed by Moses and Aaron, they were mistaken, for surely it was no easier to make frogs than locusts ; it was no easier to convert a dead rod into a living serpent, than to convert dead dust into living lice : the power was substantially the same in both cases, because the result was the same in kind. This opinion must therefore be abandoned, because it is at war with common-sense, and is fatal to the truth of the whole story, making the reason given by the magicians for their discontinuance evidently and stupidly false, and unlikely to have been presented at all, because of previous successes in works of no less difficulty.

Another question just here is suggested. What good reason can be given why God should not only allow, but enable the magicians of Pharaoh to work real miracles in opposition to his own servants? I reply, the best in the world. By means of the success of his magicians, Pharaoh reassured himself, and was the *cause* of hardening his own heart on the *occasion* furnished by God for that purpose; so that the cruel tyrant should be punished for his crimes through his own agency. Besides, the attempted performances of the magicians were not impositions by their own contrivance, but were divinely made true miracles, apparently opposed, but really in aid of the servants of God. These magicians were the privy councillors of the king, to whose united wisdom he was accustomed to defer. God gave them power, amazing to themselves, to work three miracles in succession, as fast as Aaron did, but denied them the power to work another one in imitation of any of the seven subsequently wrought, neither of which was of more difficult execution. There was no apparent reason why they should not continue to be successful. Their trial and failure, in this view of matters, showed them that their previous success was not attributable to their own art, but to a higher power; hence their declaration to Pharaoh, that these miracles were wrought by the hand of God. Pharaoh therefore had the united evidence of those to whose decision he had committed this case, and therefore was bound to respect the demand of Moses and Aaron, as of divine authority. If the magicians had not suc-

ceeded at all, they could not have explained the matter any more or better than Pharaoh; but by working three of the miracles, the like of which they were conscious they never did before, and which they well knew was not in consequence of any power within their art, because the other seven were no harder to perform than the first three, they spoke from experience, and not from mere opinion, in their advice to the king. Siding with him in the first instance, they were at length made to feel that they were all in the wrong, and in danger, too, unless they turned over to the side of Moses. As his councillors they therefore made known their convictions to the king, who, in his obstinacy, was thus left without excuse.

This interesting narrative shows us that God himself established in early history this fact, that he sent and should send chosen men as messengers to men to declare his will; and set forth that the working of miracles should be their credentials, furnished by himself in testimony of the fact, and of the right divinely invested in them to proclaim Revealed Truth. Ex. 4: 6 9. The evidence of a divine mission must be made clear to the senses of men, and in no other way, before it can be accepted. It is the "*voice of the sign*," which is divine. The nature of the proof must correspond to the nature of the claim. As it cannot be shown that a divine mission of a man to men is an impossibility, it cannot be shown that the evidence of such mission is incompatible with the nature of things. Hence, during the continuance of such extraordinary missions as we find

spoken of throughout the Old Testament, we look not in vain for the evidence divinely given to secure human confidence in them. Miracles therefore were not new phenomena in the world, when the antitype of Moses appeared to convince men by "the works of God" of his own divine mission.

Thus I return to the question—What kind of works did Christ perform which brought a Jewish Rabbi to the conviction that "God was with him"? How do they compare with those of Moses? A glance should satisfy all men, as it satisfies us, that while some were equal and others immeasurably superior, all were far beyond them in this respect, that Moses as the *servant* performed in the name and by the authority of Jehovah; while Christ as the *Son* of God wrought his works in his own name and by his own authority, and directed others so to do. Moses was powerless without the rod of God in his hand, Christ was powerful because God was in him. His works were therefore "the works of God," and no one can deny it, because they fall within classes, all necessarily excluding every other agency. They are:

1. Works of creation, such as turning water into wine by the mere act of willing it; and multiplying a few loaves and fishes into a quantity of provision adequate to feed many thousands, with a surplus of fragments left greatly exceeding the original supply.

2. Works of mercy, such as curing organic defects, giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, power of limbs to the lame, and perfect

health to those afflicted with diseases incurable by human means.

3. Works of control over the spirit-world, as in the expulsion of demons from those possessed by them.

4. Works of omnipotence, such as allaying the winds ; bringing the tossing waves of a sea to an instant calm by a word of command ; bringing its fishes in a great multitude instantly within nets that had been set for them a whole night without success ; withering a fig-tree from the roots by a word ; walking on the waves of the sea, and raising the dead. I need specify no others.

That these, if ever performed, were "the works of God," no believer in the divine existence will deny. The only question is, *Were they actually done ?* If so, then the claims of Christ in all their extent are indubitably true, and Revealed Truth is a stupendous fact. How then shall these miracles be verified ? By what way can we prove their reality ? Clearly in no other way than the common one by which all other facts are proven. They are so wonderful in their nature and effects that confessedly mere human power is not competent to execute any one of them ; and therefore they were the only proof that could be suitable for the verification of claims so extraordinary as those set up by and in the behalf of Jesus of Nazareth. These miracles are abundantly proved to have been wrought by him day after day, for the space of three years, in the midst of multitudes ; and the fame of them spread all over the country of the Jews and far beyond, by the re-

ports of all kinds of men who had witnessed them, enemies as well as friends ; and these reports were uniform in one remarkable respect, that they were such works as none but God could do. Even the malice of enemies admitted their performance by *superhuman* power, though they decried that as an evil agency ; now the admission of enemies is the best of proof. The natural incredulity begotten of experience in a world where deceptions abound, made it the interest of every beholder to dispute them if possible, and to this end, to examine them and the effects of them with the closest continuous scrutiny ; and now, what is the final result ? We find nothing on earth so abundantly and unanimously proven to be true, as the miracles of Christ and his apostles. To dispute it, is to set up individual opinion against the greatest amount of the most positive testimony that has ever been gathered in defence of any subject or thing in the world ; and that such testimony to known deception as absolute truth should exist at all, is an impossibility in the nature of things. This testimony does not relate to abstractions, but to one simple objective fact. What, then, is the law upon such a matter by which Courts of justice are governed ? It is this :

" In trials of fact, by oral testimony, the proper inquiry is not whether it is possible that the testimony may be false, but whether there is sufficient probability that it is true."—Greenleaf, as above, p. 23.

Can there, then, be any appreciable probability that the mass of testimony aforesaid to the *fact* of

the performance of miracles is false, when all known experience proves that no such amount of testimony on any secular matter of fact has ever occurred in the world? Certainly not; there can be but one rational opinion on this point.

"In proceeding to weigh the evidence of any proposition of fact, the previous question to be determined is, *When* may it be said to be proved? The answer to this question is furnished by another rule of municipal law, which may be thus stated:

"A proposition of fact is proved when its truth is established by competent and satisfactory evidence."

"By competent evidence is meant such as the nature of the thing to be proved requires; and by satisfactory evidence is meant that amount of proof which ordinarily satisfies an unprejudiced mind, beyond any reasonable doubt.

"In a question of fact in human affairs, nothing more than moral evidence can be required, for this is the best evidence which, from the nature of the case, is attainable. Now as the facts stated in Scripture History are not of the (mathematical) kind, but are cognizable by the senses, they may be said to be proved when they are established by that kind and degree of evidence which, as we have just observed, would, in the affairs of human life, satisfy the mind and conscience of a common man. When we have this degree of evidence, it is unreasonable to require more. A juror would violate his oath, if he should refuse to acquit or condemn a person charged with an offence, where this measure of proof was adduced.

"Proceeding further to inquire whether the facts related by the four evangelists are proved by competent and satisfactory evidence, we are led, first, to consider on which side lies the burden of establishing the credibility of witnesses. On this point the municipal law furnishes a rule, which is of constant application in all trials by jury, and is indeed the dictate of that charity which thinketh no evil:

"In the absence of circumstances which generate suspicion, every witness is to be presumed credible until the contrary is shown, the burden of impeaching his credibility lying on the objector."—*Ibid.*, p. 25.

"This rule serves to show the injustice with which the writers of

the Gospels have ever been treated by infidels—an injustice silently acquiesced in even by Christians—in requiring the Christian affirmatively, and by positive evidence, *aliunde*, to establish the credibility of his witnesses above all others, before their testimony is entitled to be considered, and in permitting the testimony of a single profane writer, alone and uncorroborated, to outweigh that of any single Christian. It is time that this injustice should cease; that the testimony of the evangelists should be admitted to be true, until it can be disproved by those who would impugn it; that the silence of one sacred writer on any point should no more detract from his own veracity or that of the other historians than the like circumstance is permitted to do among profane writers; and that the four evangelists should be admitted in corroboration of each other as readily as Josephus and Tacitus, or Polybius and Livy.

“But if the burden of establishing the credibility of the evangelists were devolved on those who affirm the truth of their narratives, it is still capable of a ready moral demonstration, when we consider the nature and character of the testimony, and the essential marks of difference between true narratives of facts and the creations of falsehoods. It is universally admitted that the credit to be given to witnesses depends chiefly on their ability to discern and comprehend what was before them, their opportunities for observation, the degree and accuracy with which they are accustomed to mark passing events, and their integrity in relating them. The rule of municipal law on this subject embraces all these particulars, and is thus stated by a legal text-writer of the highest repute.

“The credit due to the testimony of witnesses depends upon, firstly, their honesty; secondly, their ability; thirdly, their number and the consistency of their testimony; fourthly, the conformity of their testimony with experience; and fifthly, the coincidence of their testimony with collateral circumstances.”

“Let the evangelists be tried by these tests.

“And *first*, as to their *honesty*. Here they are entitled to the benefit of the general course of human experience, that men ordinarily speak the truth when they have no prevailing motive or inducement to the contrary. This presumption is applied in courts of justice, even to witnesses whose integrity is not wholly free from suspicion; much more is it applicable to the evangelists, whose testimony went against all their worldly interests.

"In the *second* place, as to their *ability*. The text-writer before cited observes that the ability of a witness to speak the truth depends on the opportunities which he has had for observing the fact, the accuracy of his powers of discerning, and the faithfulness of his memory in retaining the facts once observed and known.

"It is always to be presumed that men are honest and of sound mind, and of the average and ordinary degree of intelligence. This is not the judgment of mere charity, it is also the uniform presumption of the law of the land, a presumption which is always allowed freely and fully to operate, until the fact is shown to be otherwise by the party who denies the applicability of this presumption to the particular case in question. Whenever an objection is raised in opposition to ordinary presumptions of law, or to the ordinary experience of mankind, the burden of proof is devolved on the objector by the common and ordinary rules of evidence and of practice in courts. No lawyer is permitted to argue in disparagement of the intelligence or integrity of a witness against whom the case itself afforded no particle of testimony. This is sufficient for our purpose, in regard to these witnesses. But more than this is evident from the minuteness of their narratives and from their history. Matthew was trained, by his calling, to habits of severe investigation and suspicious scrutiny, and Luke's profession demanded an exactness of observation equally close and searching. The other two evangelists were as much too unlearned to forge the story of their Master's life, as they were too learned and acute to be deceived by an imposture.

"In the *third* place, as to the *number and consistency* of their testimony there is substantial truth, under circumstantial variety, enough of discrepancy to show there could have been no previous concert among them, and at the same time such substantial agreement as to show that they were all independent narrators of the same great transaction as the events actually occurred.

"In the *fourth* place, as to the *conformity of their testimony with experience*. The title of the evangelists to full credit for veracity would be readily conceded by the objector, if the facts they relate were such as ordinarily occur in human experience."
—*Greenleaf*, pp. 26-36.

The estimable and talented author whom I have so largely quoted has rendered valuable service in the discussion now in hand; and I am happy to say that, as a *legal* question, he has placed the claims of the Gospel beyond reasonable dispute, and has left infidelity crimsoned with the disgrace of an opposition demonstrably due to pure malevolence.

These narratives record many and wonderful miracles. Here we may be told that "it is quite unnecessary to expend breath upon that which is taken for granted, when it needs to be proved; for such a thing as a miracle can never occur, and is plainly impossible, because every one knows that the course of things is uniform, and proceeds upon an established uniformity according to the laws of nature, which admit of no suspension, much less infraction. They secure the confidence of all men, savage and civilized, and upon their undeviating exactitude of operation all men of all ages have relied and do rely." But in this statement there is an evident assumption of the thing to be proved, and the objector has no right to use an argument encumbered with the same difficulty he charges upon the one he combats. Besides, it is a fallacy; because it presupposes that the so-called laws of nature are *principles* instead of *general facts*, and that they are pre-existent to nature itself. Moreover, the objector bases his assertion upon another, that matter is eternal, and consequently that the universe is either eternal or an effect without a cause. This would be to admit the mightiest of miracles, for whether the

universe be created, or has ever existed as a causeless fact, it is the miracle of greatest magnitude. David Hume, who had, it would seem, the acutest mind that ever soared among the clouds of infidelity, is the parent of that celebrated argument from *experience* against the possibility of miracles, with which the most of us perhaps are acquainted. Hume was indebted to Hobbes for the doctrine that there is no necessary connection between cause and effect, but since this is an assumption, and more manifestly contrary to universal observation and experience than miracles can be supposed to be, he evidently could not consistently plead against them the very difficulty that encumbered his own doctrine. He, however, was so effectually answered by Campbell that he failed to make any attempt at reply, yet the infidels of our day continue to employ this exploded argument, just as if it had never been refuted by Brougham, Chalmers, and others who have thrice slain the slain since Campbell wrote.

We take it for granted, that no one who accredits the works of nature to the designing mind and creative power of God will be fool enough to say, that in shaping and adapting her laws of progress by an arrangement of things called by us causes and consequents, he unwittingly legislated himself out of the control of his own universe. It is then as evidently consistent with reason as it is clearly competent to omnipotence, that the divine energy should work for special purposes away back in the line of causation, without disturbing the general laws of nature; or in a more imme-

diate and direct way, to create miracles without interfering with their operation at all. For this purpose it is not necessary that God should suspend any one of them for a moment. A law of nature may simultaneously act, and be acted upon even by ourselves in a small way. Does any one suppose that the law of gravity, for example, is suspended when he sees a huge stone ascending mid-air, to its destined place at the top of a lofty building? No, because he sees the mechanical contrivance at work by which that law is counteracted, while acting all the time with its full force upon the ascending stone. Did a bystander, ignorant of this contrivance, and not seeing its connection with the stone, behold the ascent, he would exclaim, A miracle! and to him profoundly ignorant of mechanics, and seeing nothing but the stone, it would be a miracle. Will any one, then, pretend to believe that what man can do on a small scale with visible means of counteraction, God cannot do on a large scale without the means of counteraction being made visible to his creatures? Surely not, if he have a mind bigger than that of a beetle. Every wonder is not a miracle, though every miracle is a wonder; and consists in the power of God counteracting the laws of nature for a special purpose. Hence the difference between the false and the true in this matter. Now when we consider the *moral* end of miracles, I think they must be viewed as the most appropriate evidence God could give in order to beget confidence in any new truth or truths necessary to be known for human welfare.

Two objects were to be gained by the miracles of our Redeemer and his apostles: the one to illustrate his own glory as the Son of God, the Messiah of Israel, and to prove his mission as God's great apostle, competent to instruct men in divine fact and truth, necessary to be known for their salvation; and the other to give proof corresponding to the claim that the Gospel is "worthy of all acceptation," and the only true religion upon the face of the earth. These objects were secured not merely by the miraculous nature of his works, overwhelming men with the utmost astonishment, but by their moral character, leading them to see that the moral ailments of the soul could only find relief in him whose divine benevolence was expended in curing those natural diseases which were beyond the reach of human skill; for these miracles were not only great, but gracious; not only mighty, but merciful; not only demonstrative of inherent divine power, but of unspeakably benevolent design in him who came to announce himself able and willing to save every soul reposing in him for absolute deliverance from "the second death," and for absolute bestowment of a glorious immortality. Considered as works of supernatural power, miracles were designed as the seal of heaven to stamp his mission and his gospel with the authority of Almighty God; considered as works of benevolence, they were intended to win the confidence of every generous heart to both, as the Saviour and the means of salvation befitting the nature of divine mercy, and every way suited to the

wretchedness of man. They were the *natural* signs of the *moral* thing signified, pointing to higher wonders than those addressed to the natural eye. Christ came to seek and save the lost; to this end, all that he did and all that he said had a uniform tendency. Hence it is that every miracle had its moral, and was symbolical of greater, higher, holier things than were immediately apparent to the crowd of spectators whose applause followed its performance. To suppose miracles only designed to attest the truth of doctrine, would be to overlook much of their actual use, to miss the impressive lessons which they teach every mind apt to learn, and to lose the richest repast which they bring to the hungry heart.

In their *attesting* character, they all have the same object, like so many concurring witnesses, to make up cubic solidity of testimony, and they have done it; but in their *illustrative* character, they illumine the important lessons of the Gospel. They show how Christ destroys the works of the devil, and that he is able and assuredly will rescue this little province, revolted from the Empire of God, from its present ill condition, and bring it back to allegiance never again to be broken. ROM. 8 : 19-23.

From what I have now said, one thing at least must appear plain. Upon the supposition that Revealed Truth is possible, it is to a certain extent probable. *So far*, then, miracles in attestation of it ought to be performed, because they afford extraordinary proof commensurate with

extraordinary claims ; because, as we have shown, they do not violate the laws of nature, and because human confidence could not in any other way be so well secured ; therefore, if revelation be possible, the position of the infidel is impossible in the nature of things, and this shows the absurdity of its assumption. I therefore say, that the denial of well-established facts, unsupported by any thing but the *à priori* apprehension of a mind averse to the truth which they circumstantially confirm, is worth no more for an argument than the slaver of a laboring beast impatient of restraint.

LECTURE III.

REVEALED TRUTH.

THE A POSTERIORI ARGUMENT.

Humanity not derived from brutality—Quotations from Darwin and Haeckel—Facts unshaken must be accounted for—Testimony of enemies most reliable—Testimony of Judas, what it proves—Why Christ chose him—Josephus' testimony shown to be unimpeachable—Testimony of Tacitus—Admitted by Gibbon—Pilate's report—Importance of it in the *a posteriori* argument—Celsus—Porphyry—Pliny's letter and Trajan's answer—Julian—Facts established by twelve principal enemies, and a multitude of friends—Infidel argument a conspicuous failure—Strauss—Renan—The *a posteriori* argument irrefutable—Revealed Truth triumphant—*Disbelief and misbelief.*

THE great Author of our being did not develop man out of any of the lower animals. He did not make him simply the most respectable brute, such as some of our scientists seem to claim that they are, and avow themselves contented with the ancestral character; but he created him an incarnated soul, endowed with reason and conscience, and never required him to believe any thing confounding to the one or in conflict with the other.

Our "scientists," as they call themselves, affect to put contempt upon this, gravely informing us that reason is nothing but a development of matter, common to men and beasts, and conscience a thing of educational instinct.

Darwin says: "Prof. Huxley, in the opinion of most competent judges, has conclusively shown that in every single visible character man differs less from the higher apes than these do from the lower members of the same order of primates." "The conclusion that man is the co-descendant with other species of some ancient, lower, and extinct form is not in any degree new. Lamarck long ago came to this conclusion, which has lately been maintained by several eminent naturalists and philosophers; for instance, Wallace, Huxley, Lyell, Vogt, Büchner, Rolle, and especially by Haeckel."—*The Descent of Man*, vol. i., pp. 3, 4. Their volumes, filled with such irrational sentiments, are offered as proof of a position so intensely absurd that it defies the resources of rationality to do more in the way of an answer than express its indignation, pointing to such theorists as the most conspicuous examples of what infidelity can do for besotting the intellect. The assumption that this is the result of science, is a joke at their own expense.

Viewing man, as he everywhere recognizes himself, and as the Scriptures describe him, an original being from the *start*, endowed with an intellectual and moral nature, we must see that he is a creature of necessities which grow out of that nature, which can alone be met out of the

storehouse of divine benevolence, and which are not included in the wants of the brute creation. If God, who is repudiated by our learned authors aforesaid, have given man to know a class of facts and doctrines answering to these necessities of his mental and moral being, but impossible to be known in any other way than that of supernatural revelation, he must have given him therewith certain infallible proofs of it whenever and wherever made. If we now show that this is just what has been done, by a line of facts infinitely more reliable than those depended upon by our "scientists" for their enormous conclusions, and that the evidence is just what is befitting, and, so far as we can see, imparted by the best possible methods, we may fairly claim a triumph so absolute as to drive all gainsayers into the position, not merely of atheists, but of anti-theists, whose only remaining excuse for their opposition to Revealed Truth will be a dogged assertion that there cannot possibly be a God to reveal it. To this position our more advanced "scientists" have already come. Bruno has thus expressed it: "A spirit exists in all things, and no body is so small but contains a part of the divine substance, by which it is animated." In quoting this amazing sentence, Haeckel calls it "a noble idea of God"! Drunkenness then must be a divine virtue, since it is produced by imbibing God distilled from vegetable matter!

However absurd such sentiments are, the most determined of their authors cannot deny the facts of Christianity as they are now known

the world over, with which the *à posteriori* reason begins investigation. I mean such facts as the existence of the visible Church, her Bible, her ministry, her sacraments, her Sabbath, her assemblies, her forms of worship, her monumental structures, her working force, her world-wide influence in the formation and continuance of the Christian chronology ; an influence that has grown up from a beginning the most unpromising and most unlikely to produce it. These *facts* they are bound to account for in some such way as shall show our theory of them to be not only wrong but unreasonable, and shall prove their existence possible upon some other ground more satisfactory, and more in accordance with the philosophy of history and the natural sequences of things. We show by every possible method of proof, direct, indirect, and circumstantial, that, unlike any other, the Christian religion is based on a *foundation of facts* unique in themselves, and satisfactorily explaining all the consequential facts just named, all of which are links of the same chain upon which the hand of honest investigation may glide along until it reaches the very manger in Bethlehem, where the young child lay who was "called Jesus, because he should save his people from their sins." Our opponents must show either that there is no necessary connection between the former and the latter facts with which themselves are familiar, or that the whole chain is suspended upon a hook of fiction fastened in an obscure corner of the world, nearly two thousand years ago. But they have never made any respectable

attempt to do either; yet, until this is done, the Christian religion remains unshaken in its claim to be a system which carries in the van of its march the most indubitable evidence of its supernatural origin. If such had not been the fact, nothing could have saved it from instant exposure by its earliest enemies, whose ability, opportunities, and inclination were fully equal to insure success. If the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, with all their attending circumstances as recorded, had not taken place; if the miraculous works, the prophetic announcements, the wonderful utterances, the great principles, the original doctrines predicated of him had been mere accretions of fable, gradually gathered with the lapse of time around some small nucleus of inadequate fact—nothing could have been easier than an early demonstration of the imposture. It is utterly incredible that, instead of this, such an imposture should have so succeeded as to have been prized more than life by thousands upon thousands who suffered for the sake of the Gospel rather than disown it as the cause of God. Surely, then, if these facts were false, and these doctrines the unsupported figments of an imbecile fanaticism, the world, for the first three centuries of the Gospel's most conspicuous success, must have been peopled with races of knaves, or cursed with generations of fools. In either case they would have left the legacy of their debased character to their successors. But nothing of the kind existed. On the contrary, the first hundred years of our era was

a very enlightened age compared with previous centuries, and for this reason. Conquests of barbarians had been made, Roman civilization largely extended, and the times favored the culture of letters. "Literature and the arts," says Mosheim, "with the study of humanity and philosophy, became generally diffused, and the cultivation of them extended to countries that previously had formed no other scale by which to estimate the dignity of man than that of corporeal vigor or muscular strength." Amid these circumstances, so favorable to popular elevation, Christianity began its history. Fifty years after the crucifixion, multitudes in all parts of the Roman empire accepted it as true, and based its facts and its success upon the great foundation fact of the resurrection of Christ. No system of fact and doctrine was ever taught which so soon as commonly known, as to their tendency, met with universal hostility. But this hostility did not begin with the *denial* of proffered truth. Jew and Gentile were bitterly opposed to each other, but both unitedly opposed Christianity, simply because it assailed the false hope and self-righteousness of the one, and the idolatry and licentiousness of the other, as alike ruinous to the interests of mankind in every aspect. While it enforced moral truth that was or might have been known, it taught original truth that could not otherwise have been known. It won strong friends, for which reason it excited strong enemies, whose aim was to destroy it; and to suppose they did not act in obedience to such motives as hatred

always prompts, is to suppose that the men of that period were more virtuous than those of succeeding generations. At no time in human history have the instincts of an evil nature acted more vigorously than at the period of which I am speaking. It has brought down to us the indisputable knowledge of a conflict between the friends and foes of Christianity, so long, so sharp, so ferocious and bloody as to form one of the most unmanageable arguments that infidelity has to encounter: I mean the admission of early and competent enemies when they did speak, and their significant silence when they could not speak. The beginning of it we have in the gospel history. It is admitted on all hands that the testimony of an enemy is worthy of implicit reliance. If one man known to be hostile to another is compelled to bear witness to his integrity, that evidence is more surely taken for exact truth than the evidence of a friend who may be supposed somewhat biassed in his favor. Keeping this in view, I propose to prove the truth of the four gospel narratives by just such testimony, contenting myself with bare references to that of friends, who by thousands sacrificed their dearest worldly interests, braved dangers, and embraced the cruellest forms of death rather than surrender their faith and hope in Christ. I begin with Judas Iscariot.

He was a chosen apostle, who with the rest was familiar with Christ in private and in public during the whole of his ministry. If ever Christ had a subtle enemy in the world, Judas Iscariot

was that enemy. If ever there was an apostate who belied all his professions with the utmost coolness, Judas was that apostate. If ever there was a traitor who, unprompted by malice, could sacrifice the dearest interests of others to the self-interest of calculating ambition, Judas was that traitor; and if ever there was a wretch combining in his heart of falsehood the meanest elements of human villany by his own showing, Judas was that man. To find this enemy, this apostate, this traitor, this wretch tortured at last into the necessity of proclaiming the innocence of Christ and the justness of his cause, sealing the truth of his evidence with his own blood, is something so surprising in itself, that the warmest friends could never have expected it. Let us not forget that the testimony of an enemy is ever admitted to be the strongest positive evidence possible in favor of the one against whom his enmity is directed. Peter, Paul, and John have nobly proved the truth of Christianity, but opponents like Strauss and Renan remind us that they were the ardent friends of its Founder, and becoming deeply involved in his plans, or acting upon their own after-thoughts, they very likely felt themselves pledged to carry them out by every means in their power. Very well; let these gentlemen observe that we present now a witness to whom they can take no such exception, whose testimony is of an irresistible nature, and enforced by circumstances so strangely corroborative and so strongly demonstrative, that it can be subject to no such drawback as they imagine hampers

the evidence of all the other apostles; a testimony which meets them upon the very threshold of entrance to logical investigation; a testimony which they cannot ignore without impeaching their own honesty, which they cannot discredit without disgracing their own claims as competent investigators, and for which they cannot account except upon the ground of fact and truth underlying the very cause they seek to discredit. No man can possibly deny its value to that cause, nor criticise the fairness which insists that an opponent is unworthy of respect who affects to despise, or will not consent to dispose of, an argument claimed to be unanswerable.

The assumption that Judas Iscariot is a *myth*, is a precious piece of wit in those who cannot otherwise displace his testimony. How happened it that the general sagacity of the Jewish rulers, with whom he is said to have driven his bargain, became all at once so particularly foolish as not to have published to the world the invention that heaped infamy upon their own heads? Why did they fail to convict the history of their investment of Judas' money in the Potter's Field as a forgery? There can be but one answer. The first mention of Judas in the New Testament is when Christ chose twelve out of the small number of his followers, and appointed them to be associated with himself in the strictest family intimacy, to be educated by himself for the work of the gospel ministry, and to be officially known by the term "Apostle." The catalogue of their names is thrice given, and every time ends with the name

and description of "Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him." Only a short time elapses after their appointment, when we find Judas, together with the rest, receiving from his Master power over unclean spirits, diseases, and other physical evils, and commissioned to go preaching the Gospel, and confirming it by the exercise of this miraculous power. From this time we hear nothing of him until near the close of that precious life, which his treason put into the hands of its enemies. When Peter said, in answer to a question by his Master, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," Judas united with the rest in this declaration; but his attempted concealment of character from the knowledge of the Master was in vain, for Christ immediately responded, "Have I not chosen you twelve? and one of you is a *devil*." The historian explains by saying: "He spoke of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon; for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." On the Sabbath, preceding the execution of his treason, we find all these disciples at a dinner, manifesting indignation at Mary for wasting her box of ointment upon the feet of their Master, to which Judas thus ventured to give expression: "Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?" The interpretation of his cant is thus given by the historian: "This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bore what was put therein." As the result of his trea-

son, Jesus was condemned by Pilate, after that functionary had judicially acquitted him, to suffer the most ignominious penalty known to Roman law. Matters had now gone so far as to convince Judas that his innocent Master would suffer death. Knowing his power, he had perhaps thought that Christ would miraculously escape; but now that all was against it, smitten with remorse, the poor devil brought back his thirty pieces of silver to the priests and elders, confessing his guilt in terms which he probably hoped might avail for the stay of proceedings: "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood;" but met, as he was, with the bitter taunt, "What is that to us? See thou to that," frantically he dashed down his ill-gotten gain before them, and went out and hanged himself. This completes the account given of the traitor, and it is mainly valuable as the basis of an argument which, in my judgment, cannot be shaken.

Here is a man of sense and ability, qualities for which he was made the treasurer of Christ's little company, and one in whom they all reposed confidence. He was thoroughly acquainted with the private life, knew the habits and sentiments, and finally learned the ultimate views of his Master. He was, by his silence and caution, evidently fitted to detect any imposture that might have been attempted, a man not only able but willing to gratify any resentment begotten of disappointment or miscalculating ambition. Swayed by avarice, covetous of money, prompted by selfishness, it was not in his nature that he should fail to make

a strong case against Christ, if within his power ; yet this very man, having betrayed him for money into the hands of his enemies, without assigning any reason beyond that couched in the obsequious question, "What will you give me?" no sooner reflects upon his horrible deed, than his conscience, aroused like a lion, seizes him and hurries him back to confess his iniquity, and in the strongest possible language to declare the innocence of Jesus before those malignant rulers to whom he had sold him, but a few hours before, for the price of a slave ; and finding he could not recover him, in a paroxysm of remorse he expires by his own hand almost in their very presence. Now I claim this short but sharp tragedy to be an attestation of the integrity of Christ, and of his claims, as strong as strength can make it. It is an instance of overwhelming evidence extorted from the conscience of an enemy writhing under the plunging sting of remorse, and sealed with his own blood. If by his excited manner and exciting exclamation Judas had meant no more than this, that Christ had done nothing worthy of bonds, much less of death, he clearly enough indicated that Christ's capture by them was the result of his own treason, and the absurdly wicked process by which he was condemned, the procurement of their reckless and daring malice ; but the full meaning of Judas evidently was, that innocence in all things covered the character and life of Jesus. Consequently, the following things were implied in his wailing confession :

1. Judas believed that Jesus was the Messiah,

but he found out by his teaching that the Messiah was different in all respects from the imaginary one he had been instructed to believe in by the false glosses of the Rabbis, and hence his disappointment. The wings of his carnal imagination had been clipped, and the hopes of his ambition destroyed ; yet at the same time he believed that Christ told the truth about himself, and had corroborated it by the divine testimony of works impossible to man. The Jews had accused him of blasphemy in these plain words: "Because, being a man, thou makest thyself equal with God." Now if Christ had been only a man, he would have been guilty of blasphemy; if only a good man, he would have corrected their mistake and repudiated their imputation, but he did not do it; if, then, Judas had not been convinced that he was more than man, how easily and how justly could he have accused him with a good conscience! How much more than a man, perhaps he would not have undertaken to say; but when Christ manifested before his eyes the incommunicable attributes of God, which cannot be imparted to any of his creatures without destroying the distinction between Creator and creature, and enabled him to perform miraculous works, he could not say that the Saviour of sinners was himself a sinner. Hence by "innocent blood" he meant purity of principle and holiness of life.

2. By this declaration Judas must have meant that the miracles of Christ were genuine, and his doctrines divine. He himself had been empowered with the other apostles to work miracles, and

therefore could tell whether he and they had performed them. Matthew is particular in his information that Christ on a certain occasion called his twelve chosen apostles together, and formally conferred upon them this power, and bid them to go forth and exercise it, and among their names he specifies that of Judas Iscariot. Can we for a moment doubt that he made the experiment on the first demoniac or diseased person he met? Must he not therefore have known whether he did actually heal the sick and expel demons, or failed? Surely his own experience must have inwrought the conviction that Christ was precisely what he represented himself to be. On the other hand, if he had been imposed upon in this matter he was not the man to have failed in making it known for self-justification.

3. Having had perfect knowledge of the views of his Master so far as he could penetrate, he had no ground for the least suspicion that Christ proposed any interference with the Roman Government. It was precisely this refusal that exasperated the Jews, whose highest aspiration and expectation from the Messiah was deliverance from subjection to it; hence their malevolence. If Christ had uttered a word against Cæsar, it would have been considered treasonable, but notwithstanding all their efforts his captious enemies could not elicit from him any thing of the kind; nor could Judas report any such word spoken in private. He was therefore "innocent" on this point.

4. The remorseful declaration of the traitor

implies also that his Master was compassionate, beneficent, kind, and always doing good. Hence he had no charge to make when he received the price of his treason; nor when he returned it, had he to recall any accusation, or to unsay any disparaging word. He simply confessed himself a vile traitor, and hastened to extinguish his own guilty life before the "innocent blood" should be shed.

The leading inquiry, therefore, must now relate to Judas himself. Was he a wise man or a fool? Was he or was he not competent to form a just opinion of Christ and his designs, so far as he knew them? Unless we can be assured on this point his testimony is of little worth. Happily we have not the least difficulty here, for although Christ chose his apostles from the lower walks of life, he took care that they should be men of sound minds and good sense. The most determined of our opponents have conceded this, in their impeachment of the apostles on the score of artfulness and natural shrewdness, altogether incompatible with imbecility of mind and adaptedness to their business as remarkably successful impostors. That Judas was one of their number is therefore a strong presumption in favor of his intellectual and executive ability; but to this must be added the fact that Christ raised him to a post of trust by making him treasurer for the whole, a fact indicative of his special fitness so far as the qualities of sound sense and aptness for business are concerned; and if we may build upon the opinions of his fellows, he seems to have

been in good repute among them ; for when the plainest intimation was given by Christ that one of their own number should betray him, so far as the history shows, not one of them was led to suspect Judas, until he was pointed out to John ; and even then they misinterpreted the words of the Master. The manner, too, in which Judas conducted himself from first to last is indicative of no failure of qualification in the particulars named. However he may have come to form his treasonable design, he showed much tact in concealment, at such times as the unsparing lash of language against fraud, hypocrisy, and wickedness must have fallen with a heavily felt weight upon himself. Prudence no less than secrecy was the result of his forethought. Frequently his brethren expressed their old inherited idea and expectation of a sensuous kingdom ; but marking and mistaking the silence of the Master on this point, cautious Judas was silent too, though this very thing had formed the only attraction which had drawn his covetous heart to the cause of Christ, and into which, from its immense popularity among the common people, he hoped it would issue. Two of them on a certain occasion displayed a merciless zeal for calling down fire from heaven upon the Samaritans who had not treated their Master with becoming respect, but Judas was never guilty of such folly. The sons of Zebedee wanted to sit on either side of Christ upon his throne, in the kingdom they thought he would establish ; but Judas betrayed no such weakness. In short, we hear nothing from this

close-mouthed man except an occasional sentiment *after* others had spoken. Silence, smoothness, and a studied carriage covered his cunning and shielded him from rebuke. So marked are these things that no one can tax Judas with a want of sense, or any other quality prized by the business men of the world. He had clearly all the requisites for a shrewd spy, an ample opportunity and sufficient inclination to do the work of one.

Various reasons have been surmised why Christ selected such a man to be an apostle, since he must have known from the first his real character. Without pretending to explain or pronounce, it may be allowed me to suggest that by this choice he would show to the world, in all after ages, that he had not been afraid to have his most secret conduct and private intercourse pass under the eye of an *enemy*; and lest some undiscoverable and unworthy end should be plausibly imputed to him, he would initiate a man of a thoroughly worldly spirit into his little company, who, having received the delegated power and exercised the privileges conferred upon the rest, might be able to testify on any matter connected with himself. This choice at any rate proves him to have been unsullied with any impure design.

Now, it will be readily granted that, upon the supposition Jesus was practising upon the credulity of the people, such was the nature of his undertaking it absolutely required accomplices. None would of course be thought of but his apostles, and they have been so represented by the champions of infidelity. Well, Judas was one

of them, and enjoyed all the privileges of the rest, and appears to have been admitted equally with them to the greatest familiarity with Christ; besides, he was the treasurer, and was active in providing for their temporal wants, not forgetting himself. Whatever may have been their enthusiasm, he was free from all such feeling as might have overridden his judgment. Having at length discovered that no worldly emolument or grand office of state was likely to reward any of Christ's adherents, there was no motive for his longer continuance with them, but that which lay in the money-bag, from which he could pick and steal as adroitly as any of subsequent times in the line of his succession, and when he finally parted company with them without resigning his office, he did not as a matter of course resign the bag. What now does this man resolve upon? Does he go to the Jewish rulers with any revelations of wrong respecting the design or the conduct of Christ? Does he indicate that their charge of blasphemy could be sustained? Does he unfold any political sentiments that might be construed into a charge of treason against the government they themselves abhorred? Does he say any thing that could afford an excuse to these rulers of his nation to apprehend the object of their hate? It is quite evident that their anxiety to make out a clear case led them to examine Judas with all sharpness. Had he uttered a word that could have been used with any show of evidence, it would have been made prominent in the history of the mock trials before the High Priest and Pi-

late ; it would have been cast in the teeth of the traitor when he returned to confess his criminality ; it would have been hurled at the apostles when they were afterwards brought before the dignitaries of the Sanhedrim ; but on no occasion after his crucifixion was a word from Judas produced in evidence against Christ.

“ I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent blood ! ” Let now any man attempt to account for the paroxysm of horror which drove the unhappy traitor to suicide, with the supposition that Jesus was other than he claimed to be, and that Judas knew all. I would venture to predict that his logic would crimson his cheek before he had gotten half through ; for then all reason for the traitor's violence would be swept away. So far from being tormented with remorse, his course in the delivery of Jesus, however cowardly, would have admitted of some justification. Can any one fail to see that such a person as Judas would never have killed himself for justifying his conduct ? Unless Christ was what he claimed to be, Judas was a madman and a fool. I therefore feel quite sure of my ground when I say that the very strongest historical argument in favor of Christ and Christianity is found to lie in this incidental tragedy of iniquity punishing itself.

After all was over, the cause of the risen Redeemer became more powerful than ever. Thousands of Jewish converts spread consternation among its enemies. They had indeed crucified Christ, but they had not killed Christianity. His resurrection was an astounding fact, first proved

to his murderers by their own guard set over his tomb, and afterwards by evidence of overwhelming preponderance, giving mighty power to all preceding miracles, and becoming in itself an overshadowing fact like a mountain among hillocks at its base.

Josephus, who was born not long after the crucifixion of Christ, became the celebrated Jewish historian, whose work is still a standard among us. He bore testimony to Christ in a celebrated passage of his "Antiquities," which has long been a matter of dispute, and is as follows: "Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those who loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine propthes had foretold these and ten thousand other things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day."

This passage has been branded as an interpolation, and on that account many have hesitated to quote it as fairly among the available proofs of Christianity. While doubtful passages of historians are not needed for our purpose, I am not at all prepared to surrender this one as such, on account of such objections as Lardner

and some others have thought fatal to it. To me the balance of argument seems largely in its favor.

1. It is said to appear doubtful from this fact: Josephus was a Jew, and an enemy to the Gospel; therefore it cannot be supposed he would pen a passage admitting that Jesus was the Messiah and the worker of miracles which went to prove the truth of his claims.

Allowing that he was an enemy, he wrote as a narrator of facts of such magnitude, that he could not suppress one without beclouding his own reputation as a faithful historian; besides, the above is at best but an inference; and one, too, which seems to me to be drawn from a mistaken view of the passage. Its author mentions some facts loosely admitted by his people, while he referred to Jesus not as the true Messiah in his own regard, but as *the* Christ who was successful in forming an important event in Jewish history, and a large party called out from his nation and after his name. While Josephus professed impartiality as a historian, he purposely put into his statement inaccurate facts with a record of the main one relied upon by Christians as the test of the truth of their faith—namely, the resurrection; and then, with apparent contempt, called them “a tribe not extinct at this day.” There is an ambiguity about the whole paragraph, which makes it appear to the Jew as teaching one thing, and to the Gentile another. For example, he says Christ was “a teacher of *such* men as received the truth with pleasure.” To the Jew, a sarcasm appears in the

word "such," implying a contrast between the followers of Christ and the Pharisees, of whom Josephus was one; to the Gentile, men of unprejudiced minds are meant. He says Christ "drew over to him many of the Gentiles," which was not true of him personally when on earth, but was true afterwards; yet this way of putting it sugared the pill for the Jews. He says that Pilate condemned him to the cross "at the *suggestion* of the principal men among us," which is a very soft impeachment of the Sanhedrim, whose frantic violence intimidated the cowardly poltroon. He says again, Christ "appeared to them alive the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these *and ten thousand other things* concerning him." To the Gentile, this is a plain admission of the fact; but to the Jew, the sarcasm thickens in the words I have italicised. Josephus, therefore, admitted the facts, and all the facts, of the life and death of Christ, and of its mighty results in forming a *tribe* which for numbers might equal or exceed the natural *tribe* of Judah at the time he wrote; or, while admitting the facts, he put in a predicate of the word *tribe*, which to Jews certainly would carry the idea of sarcasm meant as well as expressed. Now this very ambiguity is in favor of the integrity of the passage, which is so ingeniously written that it shall not necessarily offend the Jews nor implicate the historical faithfulness of the author.

2. We are told that this passage is seemingly an interpolation, because it was not found in several early copies of the "Antiquities," and that its oc-

currence in other and later copies throws suspicion upon its genuineness.

But on what principle? We know it is much easier to *erase* than it is to interpolate. Josephus wrote more for others than for his own people, and when a copy of his work came into the hands of the Jews, they might have judged this passage fitted to popularize the facts they were most anxious to cover up, and so erased it that it should not appear in copies made by Jewish transcribers; while those, and the more numerous, falling into the hands of Gentile Christians, would not be so mutilated. There is, therefore, no force in this objection.

3. We are told that this passage was not quoted by any of the Fathers before Eusebius, who wrote A.D. 324, from which time it was found in all subsequent copies; and this proves that it was an interpolation by him or some other Christian writer.

I regard this as the weakest reason assigned for the opinion I am striving to show as unwarranted. *First*, Because many of the writings of the Fathers are *lost*; and no one can say that this passage was not quoted by some of them. *Second*, Because neither Eusebius nor any other Christian writer would put such sentences together in an interpolation, in some particulars contradicting the Evangelists, and in others slurring the Christians, and extenuating the fact of Jewish violence in the murder of Christ. *Third*, Because the Roman historian Tacitus, who wrote A.D. 110, narrates in his own language the main ideas of this passage, which

he must have gotten from Josephus; and therefore Eusebius did not interpolate; or, if not from Josephus, he must have gotten it from the Roman record, or from a gospel in his own hands; in either case, the passage of Josephus is proved in its facts to be true. Now it is customary among deceivers to *erase* the truth, but never to interpolate it. *Fourth*, Many authors quoted the same words from Josephus, besides Eusebius. Whiston enumerates twenty-two, from A.D. 324 to A.D. 1480. And, although they all wrote after he did, it is entirely gratuitous to say that they all *copied* from him. I therefore believe the passage in question to be genuine, and ought not to be given up. But, supposing Josephus to have been silent on this whole matter, about which he had abundant knowledge, and which he could not entirely suppress without bringing suspicion upon his own reliability as a historian, the Roman historians confessedly could have had no motive to be silent about the most wonderful event of their own or near their own day.

It had been the settled policy of the Roman Government to tolerate all forms of religion, so long as they did not interfere with their own system of idolatry; and this policy continued until it became evident that Christianity was making great inroads upon the state religion. It had some twenty-five years for a start, and a fair field to work in for that time. It had been popularly regarded by Gentiles as a new form of Judaism for that length of time, and excited no special attention among Roman officials until it came to be

understood as hostile to every other religious system, and an enemy to idolatry, daily increasing its power and success. Then the most violent persecution began, and all the power of the state was enlisted for its destruction. During a long term of years, a mountain of guilt absolutely frightful to look upon, was rolled up by these officials. They soaked their soil with Christian blood ; but while the followers of Jesus fell by thousands, by some mysterious agency they rose by tens of thousands. Like the oppressed Hebrews, the more they were cut down, the more they multiplied and grew. This amazing fact begot the proverb—"The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."

About thirty years after the crucifixion, and in the tenth of Nero's reign, a great fire occurred in the city of Rome. Not long after, by some means, it came to be generally believed that the odious tyrant himself was the cause of the calamity, in order to find a plausible pretext for murdering Christians, upon whom he strove to throw the odium due to himself ; and thenceforward he carried on a most bloody work of cruelty and crime. Some forty or fifty years after, Tacitus published his history, A.D. 110, and in it he speaks of this conflagration as follows :

" They (Christians) derive their name and origin from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius had suffered death by the sentence of the procurator, Pontius Pilate.—The confessions of those that were seized discovered a vast number of their accomplices ; and they were all convicted, not so

much for setting fire to the city, as for their hatred of the human kind. They died in torments, and their torments were embittered by insult and derision. Some were nailed on crosses ; others sewn up in the skins of wild beasts, and exposed to the fury of the dogs ; others again, smeared over with combustible materials, were used as torches to illuminate the darkness of the night. The gardens of Nero were destined for the melancholy spectacle, which was accompanied with a horse-race, and honored with the presence of the emperor, who mingled with the populace in the dress and attitude of a charioteer. The guilt of the Christians deserved, indeed, the most exemplary punishment, but the public abhorrence was changed into commiseration from the opinion that the unhappy wretches were sacrificed, not so much to the public welfare, as to the cruelty of a jealous tyrant."

The most artful infidel that ever wrote thus speaks of this quotation, and his authority as a historian doubles its value : " The most sceptical criticism is obliged to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact, and the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus."—*Gibbon's Rome*, vol. ii., p. 399. Now Tacitus knew nothing of the nature of the Gospel or its religion. He was a bigoted heathen, and took no pains to ascertain the true character of those he vilified as " wretches ;" but he was well acquainted with civil history, and in no instance has been detected in falsifying facts. On the contrary, he shows his disposition to be fair, notwithstanding his prepossessions, by say-

ing that "Nero, with a view to divert suspicion from himself, inflicted the most exquisite tortures on those men who, under the vulgar appellation of Christians, were branded with deserved infamy."

The facts thus set forth by Tacitus have never been denied, while they have been abundantly confirmed by other writers; and I make the extract to show from the mouth of an *enemy*, the plenary proof that Jesus Christ really lived, taught, and suffered under Pontius Pilate, precisely as narrated in the New Testament. It further shows that he was the author of Christianity, which, surviving his crucifixion and rapidly overspreading Judea, had reached and extensively prevailed in the Imperial City itself. Although his narrative did not require Tacitus to refer to the Roman record of Reports of Provincial Governors, to which he may have been indebted, yet he was well aware that it had been the custom of the Home Government to require accurate periodical statements, officially sealed, from all such subordinates of all public affairs within the limits of their respective provinces. In accordance with this regulation, Pontius Pilate had drawn up a statement concerning the trial and crucifixion of Christ, with the extraordinary concomitants of his life and death, and sent it to be deposited in the archives of the Senate. This Roman procurator, who against his own conscience, and contrary to his own verdict, gave up Christ to the ignominy of capital punishment, merely to satiate the malice of a Jewish mob by which he was in-

timidated, had to make the best explanation he could of his criminal conduct. To this document, written shortly after the event, he affixed his own signature and seal of office, and it was constantly appealed to by the early Christians, who stood up in the face of the emperors, officers, and people of Rome, calling upon them to search it for the *facts* which sustained their cause, and to produce it for the satisfaction of all men ; but they never received a response. Thus Justin Martyr, in his Apology to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, written about A.D. 140, said : “ It was predicted that our Christ should heal all diseases and raise the dead ; hear what was said. There are these words : ‘ At His coming the lame shall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the stammerer shall be clear-speaking ; the blind shall see, and the lepers shall be cleansed ; and the dead shall rise, and walk about.’ *And that He did those things YOU can learn from the Acts of Pontius Pilate.*”—Ch. 48. Now, is it likely that Justin would have dared, in his Apology, to direct the Emperor to search a document containing a record of these things, as above stated, and to which he had immediate access, if there had been no such document as “ The Acts of Pilate ” ? The supposition is incredible, since such temerity would have ruined the cause in whose behalf this apology was made. Thus too Tertullian, in his apology for the Christians, written about fifty years later, and addressed to the Roman Government, after enumerating his facts, said : “ All these things Pilate did to Christ ; and now, in fact, a Christian in his own convictions, *he*

sent word of Him to the reigning Cæsar who was at the time Tiberius." Is it possible that Tertullian would have made this statement in regard to Pilate's report, if no document of the kind had ever been sent by the procurator to the Emperor? It cannot be. "Search your own public documents," said he. "At the moment of Christ's death the light departed from the sun, and the land was darkened at noon; which wonder is related in your own annals, and is preserved in your archives to this day." Would Tertullian have ventured upon such a declaration if it had not been true? The thing was impossible.

About thirty-five years after Justin wrote, the great work of Celsus appeared against Christianity, called "The True Word." Origen, some sixty years after, wrote a reply in eight books, in which, *seriatim*, he answered all the objections urged against the Scriptures and against Christianity; but Celsus had not denied the above facts about this matter of Pilate's report. If he had, Origen certainly would have answered him; but Celsus' experience taught him that it was not safe to deny a fact which must have been true by the law of the empire.

About A.D. 270 another champion appeared on the side of Paganism, namely, Porphyry. He was esteemed a more powerful opponent than Celsus. In attempting to write down Christianity, how came it that the mighty Porphyry did not deny the statement of Justin, nor meet the challenge of Tertullian in regard to Pilate's report? If no such document existed, how easily might the

writings of these apologists have been overthrown? Can it be believed that such a man as Porphyry would have failed to expose the "pious fraud," if these Christians had dared to fabricate a fact that could have been shown notoriously false?

Eusebius, A.D. 325, wrote as follows:

"The fame of our Lord's remarkable resurrection and ascension being now spread abroad, according to an ancient Eastern custom prevalent among the rulers of the nations, to communicate novel occurrences to the Emperor, that nothing might escape him, Pontius Pilate transmits to Tiberius an account of the circumstances concerning the resurrection of our Lord from the dead, the report of which had already been spread throughout all Palestine. In this account he also intimated that he ascertained other miracles respecting him, and that now having risen from the dead, he was believed to be a god by the great mass of the people."—*E. H.*, l. 2, ch. 2, *Cruse's translation*.

Eusebius here states the fact of a well-known custom with which every governor of a Roman province had to comply, and this makes it certain that Pilate did send the report spoken of, and that he embodied in it the specifications to which the early apologists so confidently and so often referred. This is a matter which has not received the attention it deserves. Clearly it deals a stunning blow to the advocates of infidelity. We have fortunately a fine example of such reports in a long official document sent by Pliny the younger to Trajan, the Emperor who had appointed him governor of the distant provinces on the Black Sea, A.D. 105, together with the Emperor's letter of approbation and instructions. They are as follows:

PLINY TO TRAJAN.

“Health. It is my usual custom, sir, to refer all things of which I harbor any doubts to you. For who can better direct my judgment in its hesitation, or instruct my understanding in its ignorance? I never had the fortune to be present at any examination of Christians before I came into this province. I am, therefore, at a loss to determine what is the usual object of inquiry or of punishment, and to what length either of them is to be carried. It has also been with me a question very problematical whether any distinction should be made between the young and the old, the tender and the robust; whether any room should be given for repentance, or whether the guilt of Christianity, once incurred, is incapable of being expiated by the most unequivocal retraction; whether the name itself, abstracted from any flagitiousness of conduct, or the crimes connected with the name, be the object of punishment. In the meantime this has been my method with respect to those who were brought before me as Christians. I asked them whether they were Christians; if they pleaded guilty, I interrogated them twice afresh, with a menace of capital punishment. In case of obstinate perseverance, I ordered them to be executed. For of this I had no doubt, whatever was the nature of their religion, that a sullen and obstinate inflexibility called for the vengeance of the magistrate. Some were infected with the same madness, whom on account of their privilege of citizenship, I reserved to be sent to Rome to be referred to your tribunal. In the course of this business, informations pouring in as is usual when they are encouraged, more cases occurred. An anonymous libel was exhibited with a catalogue of names of persons who yet declared they were not Christians then, or ever had been; and they repeated after me an invocation of the gods and of your image, which for this purpose I had ordered to be brought with the images of the deities. They performed sacred rites with wine and frankincense and execrated Christ, none of which things, I am told, a real Christian can ever be compelled to do. On this account I dismissed them. Others, named by an informer, first affirmed and then denied the charge of Christianity, declaring that they had been Christians, but had ceased to be so, some three years ago, others still longer, some even twenty years ago. All of them worshipped your image, and the statues of the gods, and also execrated Christ, and this was the account which

they gave of the nature of the religion they once had professed, whether it deserves the name of crime or error ; namely, that they were accustomed on a stated day to meet before daylight, and to repeat among themselves a hymn to Christ as to a god, and to bind themselves by an oath with an obligation of not committing any wickedness, but on the contrary, of abstaining from thefts, robberies, and adulteries ; also of not violating their promise, or denying a pledge ; after which it was their custom to separate and meet again at a promiscuous, harmless meal ; from which last practice they however desisted after the publication of my edict, in which, agreeably to your orders, I forbade any societies of that sort. On which account I judged it the more necessary to inquire BY TORTURE from two females, who were said to be deaconesses, what is the real truth, but nothing could I collect, except a depraved and excessive superstition. Deferring, therefore, any further investigation, I determined to consult you. For the number of culprits is so great as to call for serious consultation. Many persons are informed against, of every age and of both sexes, and more still will be in the same situation. The contagion of the superstition has spread, not only through cities, but even villages and the country. Not that I think it impossible to check and to correct it. The success of my endeavors hitherto forbids such desponding thoughts ; for the temples, once almost desolate, begin to be frequented, and the sacred solemnities that had long been intermitted are now attended afresh ; and the sacrificial victims are now sold everywhere, which could once scarce find a purchaser. Whence I conclude that many might be reclaimed were the hope of impunity on repentance absolutely confirmed."

TRAJAN TO PLINY.

" You have done perfectly right, my dear Pliny, in the inquiry which you have made concerning Christians. For truly no one general rule can be laid down, which will apply itself to all cases. Those people must not be sought after. If they are brought before you and convicted, let them be capitally punished ; yet with this restriction, that if any renounce Christianity and evidence his sincerity by supplicating our gods, however suspected he may be for the past, he shall obtain pardon for the future on his repentance. But anonymous libels in no case ought to be

attended to ; for the precedent would be of the worst sort, and perfectly incongruous to the maxims of my government."

Gibbon acknowledges these letters to be genuine, and from them it can be easily believed that Pilate's report was equally explicit with regard to Christ, and contained just such an account as the aforesaid apologists and others constantly affirmed. Pliny's letter and Trajan's answer prove that in the beginning of the second century, in the remote provinces of Bithynia and Pontus, Christianity had nearly destroyed Paganism, and the inference is natural that in the route of its progress thither it had made great havoc with the idols and temples about which Pliny speaks as "almost deserted." His letter sets forth important facts which he had received from those who had, through fear, apostatized from Christianity, such as these: the Christian Church from the first regarded Christ as God; its simple worship was addressed to him; it had its sabbaths, officers, regular assemblies, and the Lord's Supper; its doctrines and precepts were the same as we have them; and real Christians were ready to endure death in any form rather than give up their faith in Christ. Moreover, it will be seen from this letter that Tertullian hazarded nothing when he thus testified to the great multitude of Christians. A.D. 198 :

"We are but of yesterday, and we have filled every place among you—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the very camp, tribes, companies, palace, senate, forum—we have left nothing to you but the temples of your gods." "If such multitudes of men were to break away from you, and betake

themselves to some remote corner of the world, why, the very loss of so many citizens, whatever sort they were, would cover the empire with shame; nay, in the very forsaking, vengeance would be inflicted. Why, you would be horror-struck at the solitude in which you would find yourselves, at such an all-prevailing silence, and that stupor as of a dead world. You would have to seek subjects to govern. You would have more enemies than citizens remaining. For now it is the immense number of Christians which make your enemies so few, almost all the inhabitants of your various cities being followers of Christ."—*Apology to the Rulers of the Roman Empire.*

Would the apologist have dared to use such language if his facts had been either false or mingled with fiction? Who can believe it?

In the latter part of the fourth century, A.D. 360, another author undertook to write down the Christian religion. This was the Emperor Julian. To his voluminous work there were several replies by Cyril and others, which we have, and which contain many large quotations from it. Julian was a scholar as well as a statesman, and one of the most distinguished of the Roman emperors. His early training had been in the Christian religion, but for political reasons he renounced it and turned heathen. Hence he was called "the Apostate." He very well knew that all governors of dependent provinces were obliged to make, statedly, reports of all the remarkable events signaling their administrations. When he began his work, he had a good knowledge of the New Testament. He granted that the history of Christ, as given by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, together with the Acts of the Apostles, is genuine. He grants their early

date. He grants the miracles of Christ, and specifies many of them, only endeavoring to diminish the importance of his works; and then enters into speculative argument to defeat the claims of Christianity. But his reasoning was very imbecile, and if it had been more respectable, could not have prevailed against his own admissions. His confession to the truthfulness of the Christian history, by virtue of his varied means and qualifications, may well be taken as the united verdict of all previous adversaries along with himself, because he made use of the same weapons of ridicule, and pursued the same method of managing the argument. Besides, he had before him the works of Justin, Tertullian, Eusebius, and others, in each of which there was this appeal to the report of Pontius Pilate confirmatory of the foundation facts of the Gospel. This appeal had rung through the empire for more than three hundred years, and Julian must have felt the force of it. Now if there had been no such report, would this bitter enemy have failed to show it? Clearly not, because he had every facility of proving the falsehood. Instead of adopting this easiest and shortest method of confounding the Christians, he cautiously passed it over in silence, thereby admitting both its existence and the truth of all it contained.

The testimony for the following facts is therefore indubitably conclusive :

1. The historical books of the New Testament, the Gospels and the Acts, are quoted or referred to by a series of Christian writers beginning with

those who were cotemporary with the apostles, or immediately succeeding them, and proceeding in close and regular succession from their time to the present.

2. That when thus quoted or referred to, they are recognized as inspired, as possessing divine authority, and as the judge in all questions of religious duty or of controversy.

3. That they were in very early times collected into a distinct volume.

4. That they were distinguished by the names by which we know them, and held in profound respect.

5. That commentaries were written upon them, different copies carefully collated, and versions of them made in different languages.

6. That they were received by all orthodox Christians, and by many heretical sects, and accepted by all as of final appeal in controverted matters.

7. That they were publicly read and expounded as authoritative scripture in the religious assemblies of the early Christian Church.

8. That besides the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of Paul, the first Epistle of John, and the first of Peter were early received without doubt, by those whose cautiousness created some doubt about the other books now included in the New Testament canon.

9. That the Gospels were attacked by early enemies of Christianity, as the books containing the facts upon which the religion was founded.

10. That many formal catalogues of authentic

scripture were published, in all of which our present sacred histories were included.

11. That no other books than those composing the New Testament as known to us were ever accepted as belonging to it. Let it be remembered we have given only the testimony of the *enemies*, whose silence to the appeals of the early apologists is more eloquent than bare admission could have been.

In attestation of the facts and prevalence of Christianity as already stated, we have the authority of TWELVE OF THE GREATEST FOES Christianity ever encountered, namely: Tacitus, Josephus, Suetonius, Juvenal, Pliny the younger, Martial, Marcus Aurelius, Epictetus, Lucian, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian the Apostate, whose labors were continuous for the first centuries with their coadjutors; but they *all admitted the facts* upon which Revealed Truth is based. To this may be added the testimony of the Jews as found in the Talmuds in twelve places. Matthew, James, and John are admitted to have been disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, to whose name is attached the most opprobrious epithet. The miracles of Jesus, such as curing the sick, cleansing lepers, and raising the dead, particularly Lazarus, are admitted, but imputed to the power of magic. Those of his disciples are also mentioned as matters of fact.

When we turn to the evidence of friends, I can only give a few names for want of space. The early defenders of the Christian faith were such men as Barnabas, Clemens, Polycarp, Irenæus,

Ignatius, Quadratus, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Tertullian, Eusebius, with about a hundred and twenty other authors within the first five centuries. In spite of all forms of opposition and persecution, Christianity notoriously ascended the throne of the Cæsars within four hundred years, overspread the then known world, uprooting Paganism as the established religion of the Roman Empire, and took its room!

Such are the historical evidences by which the *à posteriori* argument establishes the integrity of the Scriptures and the truth of the religion founded upon them in every point. Plainly they pile up mountains round about the citadel of Revealed Truth that infidelity cannot hide from view by all the fogs it can possibly create. The very line of argument sometimes taken to discredit them operates with unrelenting power against every historical record upon earth of more than a century old. It therefore proves quite too much, and thus infidelity is shown to be a conspicuous failure. I think it is entirely too late in the day to make any more formal defence of the Evangelists against the aspersions of their very sagacious critics. If they think that these authors, born and bred in obscurity, whom they are fond of representing as impersonations of ignorance, have invented the character of Christ and the religion of Christianity, I submit whether they have not forfeited all claim to be heard on any matter of literary, historical, or speculative importance. Whether they be professors or peasants, an attempt to impose upon the common-

sense of the world, in earnest or in jest, disfranchises them from voting on the question, "What is truth?" If they sincerely believe that such men were able to forecast the future, and to predict the prevalence of their imposture all over the world in spite of all effort to kill it, the invention and the results of it as we know them prove these authors to be more miraculous characters than that of the hero of their own story; for it is unquestionable that, in spite of their imputed ignorance and obscurity, they have mounted above the loftiest flight of genius, and for eighteen centuries have sustained themselves upon the wing, confessedly the admiration of the world. This is a standing miracle, growing in magnitude with every year of the Gospel's success, and as such, greater than any they have reported.

Infidels must admit, as Gibbon did, the facts of Christianity to be historically true, and so itself to be well founded, or attempt to show them no facts at all, and so itself to be a baseless fabric of opinions. In either case their cause is logically ruined.

For credulity like theirs, then, to turn critic upon miracles of such miraculous men only provokes the laughter of common-sense. Hence our champions of modern infidelity, like Strauss and Renan, on this point at least, are quasi-monomaniacs. They seem to have had some little apprehension of this judgment, since they cautiously admit there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, a great and good man, who had no idea of advancing the claims subsequently put forth in

his behalf by the authors of the Gospels, whoever they were; and only contend that the *historical* Christ is a *mythical* character, and that nobody knows who were the persons accredited with the authorship of the Gospels. As to the first point, their theory has been exploded forever by Whately, who has used their line of *à priori* argument to prove there never was such a character as Napoleon Buonaparte; and by Schmucker, who has shown that our historical Shakespeare is a *myth*. As to the second point, this theory will not relieve their difficulty, because it only shifts it from four to an unknown number of miraculous characters who have astonished the world. These logical adaptations of their argument show its utter absurdity. We know more about Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, than we know about Plato, Cicero, Demosthenes, Tacitus, Herodotus, Horace, Virgil, or Cæsar; but if want of sufficient personal information about the Evangelists be a valid objection against the works that go by their names, and have always been accredited to their authorship, much more should we object to the accredited authorship of our commonly received classics, and to all other authorship earlier than three hundred years old.

All records, documents, and books, to be understood, must contain classes of facts for the materials of thoughts and theories advanced in them, and no matter when, where, or by whom written, they essentially carry within themselves evidences which commend them to the confidence of their readers, by augmenting probabilities with

the flow of their contents, or prove themselves unworthy of it by discovering improbabilities that must beget disbelief. It is the province of reason by the *à priori* process to pronounce in the matter. But afterwards, to make herself sure, she enters another field of investigation wholly outside of this, and finds a vast amount of circumstantial, collateral, corroborative testimony, either for or against it, which it is the province of the *à posteriori* method to collect. By these two processes in any investigation, the mind arrives at the moral certainty of discovered truth felt to be just as real as the reason itself; for if *reasoning* be not reliable for securing moral certainty of truth to *reason*, then it can answer no purpose beyond that of blind instinct. Let any young man of good common-sense, but ignorant of history, sit down to the perusal of the lives of Napoleon and of Washington; he finds in them many startling or extraordinary facts, yet possible, probable, all converging to the proof of these great men having been at the helm of great events. His reason *à priori* yields to the balance of argument against doubts. But to make sure of the truth as related in his volumes, he goes outside of them to other sources, and by the *à posteriori* method gathers a variety of testimony circumstantial, collateral, and corroborative in the current history of France and of the American Union running from their days down to his own. Must he not, then, by the laws of mind become as sure of the existence and influence of these men as of his own? Who can doubt it? Nor will these facts

of history, so well authenticated, lose any degree of credibility with the lapse of time. That which has been clearly proved to be fact, can never be proved to have been fiction. Suppose, two or three thousand years hence, another such young man should peruse these histories perpetuated to his day, would he not arrive, by the same process, to the same conclusion? Certainly, for the simple reason that the books would be so circumstanced by internal marks and external testimony, that he could not deny them without denying the truth of all history from the beginning of the world. Now we apply this method of investigation to the Scriptures as thousands before us have done, and come to the same conclusion that thousands before have reached, and for the reason that it is *impossible* to come to any other. Every time a ship crosses the Atlantic, there is an additional proof that the science of navigation is a true science; and every application of an honest method of reason to Christianity proves it to be the embodiment of Revealed Truth, perfectly adapted to the highest welfare of humanity. The only way of arriving at moral certainty on any subject is by exhaustive proof of matters of fact gathered by both processes of reason, and it is a sure way. Thus we are just as certain that the world has ever been full of matters of fact, as we are that such is its condition now; and we also know that the longer any by-gone matter of fact took for its own completion and settlement in human belief, the easier does the proof of it at any subsequent period become

powerful in argument. Now revealed truth is a matter of fact, which took fifteen hundred years for its own completion in well-authenticated and well-preserved records; and for nearly two thousand years subsequent, has not only established itself in the confidence of tens of thousands who have *died* for it, and of millions who have lived and labored for it, but has outlived its most demonstrative enemies in spite of all kinds of violent opposition, and in the vigor of strength, augmented by the struggle, now appeals to all men, as did the Master, "Believe me for the very works' sake;" and all men are responsible for attention to, or neglect of this appeal.

Pilate, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian have gone to their account long since, but unintentionally they have left a corroborating testimony to the facts of the Gospel that cannot be overturned—facts that are proved as strongly as proof can do it. And as the doctrines laid by the Scriptures upon this foundation clearly define man's essential relation to the divine government, as a moral accountable subject destined to endless duration; set forth in luminous rays the awful results of his sin and guilt, the moral ailments of his nature beyond his own means of cure; and the plan of redeeming mercy, devised by infinite wisdom, executed by infinite love, and fully in working order for present salvation—a plan by which all his legal difficulties and responsibilities are met, all his moral necessities provided for upon certain well-defined principles at once wonderful in adjustment, satisfactory to reason, positive in assur-

ance, and securing *now and here* and forever a destiny all the more glorious by virtue of personal union through faith in and the suretyship of an omnipotent Redeemer—Revealed Truth looms up before us as the grandest and most comprehensive Science that can exist. Therefore infidelity is a sin against God and a crime against man, the blackest in its nature, because the most fearfully enduring in its blinding, blasting influence, and the most deservedly damning in its ultimate issue. "Like causes produce like effects." "We judge of the future by the past," and "being forewarned should be forearmed." These aphorisms, begotten of a sore experience, may well be repeated in this connection. Let us look back to the greatest conquest infidelity has made in modern times. Let us go to the land of Voltaire, Volney, D'Alembert, and Rousseau. Their philosophy gained high eminence in 1793. Infidelity was wild with delight. Look at its achievements. Their revolutionary legislature, on one day, by a formal resolution voted God out of existence, or rather declared *there is no God*. See them, the next day, bowing in mockery of worship to a common actress, dressed up for the occasion, as the "Goddess of Reason." See them posting on their cemeteries a dismal motto of their preposterous creed, "Death is an Eternal Sleep," proclaiming emancipation from the restraints of religion, and freedom of conscience for all; yet immediately butchering all who would not yield to their principles and laws. The world cannot afford to forget that French Revolution

which has given it the most awful commentary upon the nature and effects of Infidelity. This is the red feather in its cap, dyed in human blood. We therefore say that men who, in the face of this great historic disaster, propagate the principles that produced it, are the worst enemies of the human race, and they who for filthy lucre publish and disseminate their poisoning works are partakers of their guilt. Let infidelity prevail in a government like ours, whose stability depends upon piety and virtue as taught in that great palladium of our liberty, the Bible, and our government shall never see another centennial. The Bible, the open Bible, is the fountain of life to the Republic.

When we look for the source of human knowledge, it is not hard to see that the most valuable of that which is known comes directly from revealed truth, or indirectly through a christianized public sentiment. To be convinced of this, we have only to compare the literature and civilization of the old nations of the earth and that of the Jewish people, with the intellectual and moral conditions of modern nations. It did not require much sagacity upon the part of any visitor at our late great national display, honored by every nation of any distinction in the world, to discover under what influence the greatest national success in material prosperity and usefulness has been gained. Who did not see, from a comparison between the methods and matters of education, and the implements and results of science, under what auspices her greatest triumphs had been won?

Who did not feel creeping over him a sensation of pride, as he viewed the vast variety of things both ornamental and useful produced by the handicraft of our own fair countrywomen, whose worthily high elevation is the *achievement* of the Bible? Who could avoid understanding the world's voluntary indorsement of the great truth as the Bible defines it, "Godliness is profitable unto all things"? Yes; to the Bible, and the God of the Bible working through it, are we indebted for that form of civil and religious liberty that has hitherto blessed our people and our land, from the cradle of infancy rocked by his own hand, to the highest attainments of national manhood. To this repository of revealed truth is the world indebted for all correct sentiments in the sciences of government, morals, and religion. Be sure, there is a class of men of some intellectual strength now asserting themselves most absurdly in the denial of this position, but the unfairness of their arguments is demonstrable from themselves, indebted as they are for the favorable circumstances of their own training within the atmosphere of Revealed Truth, whose sun has warmed them into the ability to sting the mother of their blessings. What would have been the attainments and the influence of our Spencers, and Tyndalls, and Darwins, and Huxleys, with a crowd of pretentious parasites feeding upon their poison, had they been born and brought up in the heart of Turkey, or of Thibet? We would smile at the credulity of a man who should attribute his enjoyments of sight to his own eyes, denying the

necessity of the light by which alone he can use them. So we regard the vain boasting of such scientists as the vagaries of sophists, who attribute their attainments to their own resources independent of the light and power of Revealed Truth that has shone upon their path, and begirt them with happy influences all the way through life.

It should appear even to them that common honesty ought to lead every fair-minded man of their intelligence to an expression of recognition, if not of gratitude, for the inestimable blessing of Revealed Truth. Human experience has been ample enough to prove its value within the domain of mere intelligence. It is the only source whence the earliest facts of history are derived. We have only to compare its wonderful contents in this respect with the absolute dearth of information in all other writings to discover that, for the first two thousand years of the world, we have not any thing at all imparted, except what Moses has made known; and for the next two thousand years we have in what little there is of profane history fact and fable so intermixed, that it is of no practical value at all. For the whole of this period we are indebted to the Bible, whose incidental notices of the affairs of the world were only designed to elucidate the historical connection with it of that people God formed, governed, and kept in a peculiar way, that they might receive and transmit revealed truth to the future nations of the earth. We know the fact by the outcome of their peculiar national life.

During the first period mentioned, when men

began to multiply, the rudiments of nations were arranged, and many interesting facts are briefly given; during the second, the details of human history are so fragmentary, so interspersed with polytheistic fable, that were it not for the works of old prophecy, as found in our volume, civil history, down to some seven hundred years before Christ, would be nearly a blank. But all this service to intelligence is as nothing when put by the side of those great moral truths which have been given for the benefit of mankind. By them we know the attributes of the true God, and the great reality of his government, together with the necessities and destiny of the human race. We can unriddle that mighty enigma of the mixture of good and evil which so perplexed and confounded the old philosophies; we can account for the disorders of nature, and point out the sources of those streams of wretchedness and woe that come like burning lava from a volcano never at rest; we can impart to those not in possession of our key of knowledge the secret of an all-wise Providence, controlling and reigning in the wild storms of human conflict that agitate the world. Other sciences account for physical facts and wonders in the world, but revealed truth is a science which accounts for the moral phenomena of the world of mind. It tells us what we might have been, what we are, and what we shall be. It opens a perfect, original plan of unspeakable mercy for the salvation of all who receive and obey it, showing us how human nature be-

came that blasted thing that it is, and the method of its recovery by Him who, as incarnate virtue, bled and died, imputatively guilty, in the room of the lost—O Lord! what a fact is this!—and that for the fabrication of legal righteousness, to answer the demands of broken law, and for procuring a method of moral purification that shall answer the inward necessities of the soul, He is offered as God's unspeakable gift, whose reception secures to every believer eternal life, now and here, no matter what the badness of his character may have been, or what the moral depth of ruin he may have reached. It uncovers the glories of heaven and the damnation of hell, with the Cross of Christ between them, by which the veriest wretch may gain the one and escape the other. It offers to every man whom it reaches the price of redemption, upon his embrace of "the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world." To that Cross was attached the wire of a heavenly-constructed telephone, over which that dear voice "It is finished" has rung through succeeding centuries in the Lord's Supper; and the hardest heart that hears it must break. Hence this volume of revealed truth, by fully meeting the deeply-felt wants of humanity, unlike all others, and like a thing of life, provides for its own diffusion, and fulfils its own wonderful declarations in this particular. This explains the wonder of its preservation against all adverse efforts. The tooth of time has not been able to gnaw away a single sentence of it, the machinations of

ingenious wickedness have all proved signal failures. The efforts of pretended friends to cloister it in concealment, and of open enemies to crush it beneath the foot of malice, have been equally impotent. Wit and satire, laws and persecution, sword and flame, have alike all failed. The many books of infidelity have perished, with the exception of a few, which modern infidelity has much ado to keep alive. Hence its change of tactics. But here is *the* Book, now in larger circulation than ever, translated and being translated into all the languages of the earth, and by what it has done proves what it will do. This fact is not equalled in the history of any other book. Long since, judging by human productions, it ought to have perished by the force of adversities no other book has ever passed through. God is its preserver no less than its author. Deny this, and the Bible, with its history, becomes the most embarrassing of all miracles. Adapted to improve the condition of man everywhere, it will civilize the savage and save the sinner. It is the bread of life, and he who casts it out of his regard for the poisoned aliment of infidelity, shall find, to his unending horror, that his mistaken choice will consign him to the pains of eternal starvation.

I have said that infidelity is not only *disbelief* but *misbelief*. The one involves the other by the laws of mind. As it is impossible for the animal appetite to be indifferent to the things necessary to be eaten for the support of life, so it is impos-

sible for the soul to be regardless of its own spiritual wants; it must assert itself, and will clamor for their satisfaction. There never was a time when man was without religious sentiments of some kind, though for ages he has been without science, and this has been owing to an instinct of his moral nature. By that he is and must continue a religious being, sure to think, feel, and act in conformity with the moral constitution upon which his consciousness as man is dependent. If his mind be under the control of disbelief, it must also be under the control of misbelief. Infidelity to truth and fidelity to error necessarily co-exist. When we speak of *modern* infidelity, we simply mean an old enemy with a new uniform in a new position. All the erratic theories of the present day are resurrections, not new creations. Having cast off their grave-garments, they appear in new attire. Atheism, Deism, Pantheism, Materialism, Positivism, Socialism, Necromancy, or Spiritualism, and all other *isms* of our time, have their counterparts in the old sophomore age of heathenism. Long before our Saviour's day, the representatives of these opinions, who lived without the light of Revealed Truth, were such men as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and others too numerous to mention. In the last century, their representatives were such men as Hobbs, Blount, Collins, Woolston, Tyndal, Chubb, Bolingbroke, Hume, Voltaire, and others. These men played off their arguments from the ground of metaphysics, and were badly beaten. The most sub-

tile opponent was Hume, and the most ingenious was his argument against miracles, which, however, was so well answered by George Campbell that Hume was forever silenced. *Modern* infidelity seeks to oppose the Scriptures and Christianity, and uphold these old errors by a newly-constructed argument upon what is taken to be scientific discovery, which overthrows the veracity of the Scriptures; but I think it will fail. The Greek Sophists thought they had discovered and used the key of knowledge in their aphorism that "Man is the standard of truth in all things;" but they were mistaken. The leading names among the Sophists of the Socratic age were enrolled among the promoters of scepticism. Pythagoras, disgusted with the pretenders of his day who called themselves Sophists, adopted a more modest name—Philosophist. But now again the synonyme of Sophist is appropriated by men who propound learned opinions implying belief of the aforesaid aphorism, equally disgusting with those which sickened Pythagoras. The ancient Sophist and the modern materialistic Scientist are as much alike as two peas of the same pod, and both of them will come under Paul's description—professing themselves wise, they have become otherwise.

The discussion of some points of great interest, like that of the resurrection of Christ, have been here omitted for the twofold reason, that space would not allow it, and that by making good the points of the general subject selected, the former would be easily accepted.

Revealed Truth having been authenticated and established by indubitable proof, and plenty of it, as an absolutely perfect science, no other science can be in conflict with it, because truth cannot oppose truth ; but of late years, *theoretical* geology has proclaimed to the world that the discoveries made by scientists in the strata of the earth force the conclusion that the Mosaic record of the creation is untrue ; and hence it follows that the Bible, thus deprived of its foundation-facts, though venerated for its antiquity, must fall as the accredited vehicle of a revelation from God to man, binding upon the human conscience and necessary for the instruction, guidance, and salvation of the soul. Several of its friends, having made geology a special study, agree with these scientists as to the age of the earth being vastly greater than that apparently assigned it by Moses ; they have therefore written volumes to *reconcile* the Bible with their geological theory, and in the attempt have advanced opinions and invented interpretations which, in my judgment, have strengthened the hands of infidelity, and weakened the faith of a multitude of Christians who have been sorely embarrassed and distressed by their speculations. Infidelity, by this instrumentality, is encouraged and is notoriously on the increase. With this persuasion, I crave indulgence for an attempt to show that the cause of the Bible and of Christianity has been greatly and needlessly injured by some of their friends. I propose to devote the last two lectures of this

course to the consideration of this subject, not for the sake of opposition, but for the sake of those whose perplexities are increased rather than diminished by the works of men who have undertaken to reconcile the Bible with this *theoretical* geology, instead of showing, as they were bound to do, that *practical* geology is in harmony with the Bible, and that *theory*, founded on geological *fact*, is not in conflict with Gen. 1, literally understood.

LECTURE IV.

THEORETICAL GEOLOGY AND THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY.

Definition of Science—Christian geologists and their works—Conflicting theories—Prof. Huxley's sarcasm—Difference between practical and theoretical geology—Quotation from Hugh Miller criticised—Assumptions and conflicting opinions—The proof their theories need, not attainable—Young Christians victimized to infidelity—Testimony of Prof. Hitchcock as to infidel tendency—The plain meaning of the Mosaic account—Hugh Miller's theory answered—Dr. Dawson's argument on the six days of creation answered—Prof. Sedgwick's charge of "sinful indiscretion"—The use made by infidelity of these theories—Quotation from a recent infidel work—Dr. Sedgwick's "sinful indiscretion" applicable to himself—Theories contrary to laws of nature, and shown to be absurd—Prof. Hitchcock's reasoning unreasonable.

A SCIENCE is a certain knowledge of a class of facts and of comprehensive general principles within a form of explanatory correlation. Its results prove its own integrity. One science cannot be in conflict with another, for the reason that truth is never at war with itself. It therefore cannot be undermined or overturned. Exclud-

ing the uncertainties of hypotheses, it claims the confidence of absolute reliance.

Such is the science of Revealed Truth, whose foundation facts and governing principles are laid down by Moses, and recognized as he laid them by every other writer of the sacred Scriptures. It is a homogeneous system, no part of which can be disturbed without general derangement. Some of these facts, and not the least important, are *physical* facts relating to the creation of the earth, and the divinely given historical detail of procedure in its construction and completion. We are informed that this occupied the period of six days.

Within the last fifty years a goodly number of naturalists, having devoted themselves to the special study of geology, have published many treatises on that subject, and have laid the world under great obligation by their valuable labors and beneficial discoveries. For all this, due gratitude is ungrudgingly rendered by every appreciative and generous mind. It is to be regretted, however, that many of them have so far mistaken their own discoveries as to bring them forward in conflict with the facts given by Moses, indorsed by Christ, and accepted by all whose inspired writings compose the canon of Revealed Truth. These geologists justify themselves in this onset by urging facts of their own discovery, which either ruinously modify or totally set the former aside. Among these are certain ministers of the Gospel, whose "scientific" labors have been more or less extensively used by appropriation in the

service of modern infidelity, and, so far as argument is concerned, fairly used, I am sorry to think, for the purpose of assailing Revealed Truth, the business of whose other friends it is to see that they shall not be successfully used for that purpose. Nothing better could be fairly expected from the labors of its open enemies, whose most effective and destructive weapons have been furnished them gratuitously by Christian geologists, who must explain this matter as best they can to the Master. To me it is perfectly amazing how any man can coolly claim that he makes reconciliation between Revealed Truth and geological theory by making the former bend to the latter. Thus the Rev. Dr. Buckland says of himself and co-laborers that "they do not impeach the judgment of those who have formerly interpreted (the Mosaic narrative) otherwise, and in this respect geology would seem to require some little concession from the *literal* interpretation of Scripture." In this apparently modest claim there is a clear admission that theoretical geology sets itself against the literally interpreted facts of Scripture, as given by Moses and indorsed by Christ; and that in this respect they must yield just so far and so much as the wisdom of Christian geological naturalists shall dictate. In this melancholy attitude they stand, the unintentional but most efficient allies of the modern impugnors of God's word.

Thus DR. D. McCAUSLAND writes ("The Builders of Babel," p. 7):

"The geologist has, from the stones, clays, and gravels that form the crust of the globe, compiled a history of the divine

modus operandi in the formation of our earthly abode, and elucidated the order in which the various forms of animal and vegetable organisms with which it has been furnished came into existence. The comparative philologist has, in like manner, from words and grammar that lay unheeded around, like the stones of the geologist, traced the *pedigrees* of the human *families* of the world to their respective sources" (the predecessors and contemporaries of Adam). "By the former, therefore, we can *test* the Mosaic record of the creation, and by the latter, the primeval history of Adam's race, preserved in Genesis."

"For centuries all Christendom, with few exceptions, believed that God had made the world and all things in it in a period of six natural days. The Bible was supposed to have stated such to be the fact, and few believers conceived that there could be any doubt upon the subject. The science of geology instructs us as to the mode in which our globe was formed, and the order in which its vegetable and animal organisms came into existence." . . . "It proves the truth and inspiration of the Mosaic record, subject *only* to the condition that we read the word 'day' in *that* chapter as indicating a long geological period of time, and not a mere natural day of twenty-four hours. And accordingly, there being satisfactory evidence within the pages of the Bible that the Hebrew word *may* be so understood, few persons of enlightened understanding have hesitated to adopt that *rendering* of the word 'day,' and to appropriate the irresistible evidence of inspiration that it carries with it!"

On the other hand, DR. JOHN PYE SMITH, "On the Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some Parts of Geological Science," repudiating this theory, holds another, viz., that the creation announced in Genesis 1:1 was the creation of the whole material universe; and that that creation dates innumerable ages *before* the six days' work recorded in Genesis 1, was begun. He says:

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. This sublime sentence stands at the head of the sacred volume, announcing that there was an epoch, a point in the flow of infinite

duration, when the whole of the dependent universe, or whatever portion of it first had existence, was brought into being ; and that this commencement of being was not from pre-existent materials. It was a *creation* in the proper sense, not a modelling, or new-forming" (p. 227).

"An hypothesis was resorted to about thirty years ago by several men of eminence in geological knowledge—that the six days of creation may be understood as periods of time of indefinite, though of very great length. Finding in frequent instances of Scripture use, what is indeed the case in all languages, that the term day is put metaphorically to denote any portion of time which has been marked by the accomplishment of some great event or series of events, it was concluded that the same figurative application might be resorted to here.

"Upon the very face of the document it is manifest that, in the first chapter the word is used in its ordinary sense. For this primeval record is not a poem nor a piece of oratorical diction, but is a narrative in the simple style that marks the highest majesty. It would be an indication of a deplorable want of taste for the beauty of language to put a patch of poetical diction upon the face of natural simplicity. But one would think no doubt could remain to one who had before his eyes the concluding formula of each of the six partitions, and evening was, and morning was, day one ; and so throughout the series, repeating exactly the same form, only introducing the ordinal numbers, till we arrive at the last, 'and evening was, and morning was, day the sixth.'

"If there were no other reason against this, which I may call device of interpretation, it would appear quite sufficient to require its rejection that it involves so large an extension in the liberty or license of figurative speech. Poetry speaks very allowably of the day of prosperity or of sorrow, the day of a dynasty or an empire ; but the case before us requires a stretch of hyperbole which would be monstrous. A few hundred, or even thousands of days turned into years would not be sufficiently ample to meet the exigency of geological reasoning ; while this way of proceeding to obtain the object desired is sacrificing the propriety and certainty of language, and producing a feeling of revolt in the mind of a plain reader of the Bible" (pp. 171-4).

Here we have the two theories in conflict, each

of which, having a number of advocates, professes to reconcile the Mosaic account with theoretical geology; but both of which fail in this particular, as I shall strive to show.

In contrasting this geological theory with the Mosaic record, Prof. Huxley observes, in his lecture at Nashville, on the "Testimony of the Rocks":

"I need not say that this view of the past history of the globe is a very different one from that which is commonly taken. It is so widely different that it is absolutely impossible to effect any kind of community, any kind of parallel, far less any sort of reconciliation between the two."

And in his lecture at New York upon "The Untenable Hypotheses," he speaks thus sarcastically of the admissions of Christian geologists, and of their theory of "reconciliation":

"In the first place, it is not my business to say what the Hebrew text contains, and what it does not; and in the second place, were I to say that this was the biblical hypothesis (creation in six literal days), I should be met by the authority of many eminent scholars, to say nothing of men of science, who in recent times have absolutely denied that this doctrine is to be found in Genesis at all. If we are to listen to them, we must believe that what seems so clearly defined as days of creation—as if very great pains had been taken that there should be no mistake—that these are not days at all, but periods that we may make just as long as convenience requires. We are also to understand that it is consistent with that phraseology to believe that plants and animals may have been evolved by natural processes, lasting for millions of years, out of similar rudiments. A person who is not a Hebrew scholar can only stand by and admire the marvellous flexibility of a language which admits of such diverse interpretations. Assuredly, in the face of such contradictory authority upon matters upon which one is competent to form no judgment, he will abstain from any opinion, as I do ;

and in the third place, I have carefully abstained from speaking of this as a Mosaic doctrine, because we are now assured upon the authority of the highest critics, and even of dignitaries in the Church, that there is no evidence whatever that Moses ever wrote this chapter, or knew any thing about it."

This is a fair hit, and well deserved; going to show what is the natural tendency, not to use harsher terms, of tampering with the words of inspiration for the accommodation of the persistent but unfounded claims of those who present themselves the best "men of science," and, at the same time, prove themselves ungodly men at best.

There is a great difference between *Practical* geology and *Theoretical* geology, which most people overlook, because this distinction has not been prominently brought out as necessary to a right view of the whole subject. Practical geology means the facts of the rocks of the earth hitherto discovered, with their mineral constituents, the fossil remains found in them, their relative position in the strata of the earth's crust as ascertained by inspection, the disruptions and other phenomena of the strata, together with whatever is observed in the composition of earths and subsoils wherever practical work has been done. Here, let it be observed, that geological research is necessarily confined to far less than a third of the surface of the globe. The water surface compared with that of the land is about in the proportion of two and three-fourths to one; the former covering about one hundred and forty millions of square miles, and the latter about fifty-two millions; and when we consider the

countries covered by the frigid zones, the vast inaccessible mountain districts, the hot malarial districts, the deserts, the morasses, the vast forests with various impediments in the way of geologists to reach great sections of the earth, it will be easily apprehended that their researches have hitherto been confined to far less than one-fourth of the globe's surface; and that their direct penetrations into its bowels are like a few small and short pin-holes here and there into an imaginable bale of cotton eight thousand miles thick. Let this be kept in view while we get at the meaning of theoretical geology.

This comprises a *theory* or the *theories* that are constructed to account for the *facts* above indicated. It does not discourse about the strata themselves or their phenomena, but it speculates about the sources of the materials composing the strata; about the times and agencies of their formation and superposition; and about the processes of natural law, atmospherical, chemical, and mechanical; first, in fixing them; and second, in disrupting them into the wildest confusion of intermingled elements. Thus it will appear that the hard work of practical geology is not at all necessary to the easy work of theoretical geology. The former comprises *real* facts all readily admitted, the latter, *supposititious* facts all as readily rejected. For example, the prevailing theory treats, as I shall show, of broken-down worlds, of old continents and successive mountain ranges of granite, and of other materials supposed to have been the comminuted matter out of which

the present earth is formed. Now, since nothing of this kind is discoverable in the strata, it is plainly an assumption, and a profound knowledge of practical geology is not necessary to qualify one to show that fact, or to confute that theory ; for the most intimate knowledge of all the materials of nature, and of the laws regulating her processes, can not throw a single gleam of light upon the questions raised by theoretical geology, as, for example, whether this earth was originally a comet, or a mere body of gas, or a ball of fire ; nothing within the range of practical geology can determine or even elucidate such questions ; nothing can be determined from the strata themselves whether the world was formed six thousand or sixty thousand years ago ; and since so small a part of it has come within the observation of practical geology, it is all the more apparent that a person with only book-learning may be perfectly competent to refute the theory by showing its inherent contradictions, impossibilities, absurdities, and bad tendency.

The question in regard to the age of the earth depends for its solution either upon facts in the strata themselves, compelling us to certain unavoidable conclusions, or upon divine testimony. If the strata show us that each of them is the residuum of an old world by indubitable proofs of disintegration through the agency of natural forces operating with their present measure of slowness, then we must accept the theory ; but if it can be shown that such was not their origin, and that a comparatively short time was required

for their superposition by the agency of natural forces in quick operation, then there is no ground for assigning to the earth a longer existence than that given in the first chapter of Genesis literally interpreted. With practical geology, therefore, we can have no quarrel, because the works of God do not contradict the word of God : but with the *Theoretical*, there is a quarrel forced upon us mainly by those who think they are doing God service in making his word yield to the demands of a theory which we propose to show will not bear investigation. Among them is Mr. Hugh Miller, who, from the fancied eminence of his position as a scientist in this department, proclaims to the world his own superior judgment thus :

“ The clergy as a class suffer themselves to linger far in the rear of an intelligent and accomplished laity, a full age behind the requirements of the time. Let them not shut their eyes to the danger which is obviously coming ! The battle of the evidences will have as certainly to be fought on the fields of physical science as it was contested in the last age on that of the metaphysics. And on this new arena the combatants will have to employ new weapons, which it will be the privilege of the challenger to choose. The old, opposed to these, would prove of little avail. In ages of muskets and artillery, the bows and arrows of an obsolete school of warfare would be found greatly less than sufficient in the field of battle for purposes of assault or defence.”—*Footprints of the Creator*, p. 45.

In this pretentious paragraph reference is had to the solid arguments of such men as Lardner, Leland, Leslie, Faber, Butler, Campbell, Paley, Watson, and many others ; “ bows and arrows,” which, however, effectually slew the Humes, Gibbons, Voltaires, and a host of like spirits who led

the van of infidelity in their day, and whose fossil remains may be found among the literary débris of the last century. They were so badly beaten that the champions of the same cause in our day have changed position in the renewal of the battle, and now charge upon Christianity with Mr. Miller's weapons, and others like them, forged in the literary workshop of our Christian geologists. It is a great mistake, however, to assert that the battle of the evidences must be refought upon scientific ground, and by artillery from behind the earthworks of geology. These evidences are garrisoned within impregnable strength, and nothing can now invalidate the claims of Revealed Truth to the dignity which belongs to it, as the most comprehensive, important, and perfect of all the sciences, for the obvious reason that it has God Almighty for its author. It is also a great mistake to suppose that the armament of infidelity, so greatly improved by Mr. Miller and his associate scientists, will be effectual to knock the cosmogony of Moses into fragments, unless its defenders be equipped with better weapons than their old bows and arrows. If it shall turn out that these "muskets" are air-guns, and this "artillery" a park of wooden cannon, we can still trust to the bows and arrows of olden warfare; and so the battle now invited by Mr. Miller himself against the Scriptures from infidelity on geological ground, will be shown not so big with stormy elements after all. His prediction is helped on to its verification by his own books, no less than by others of open hostility and of various degrees of merit, all of whose

authors rejoice in his argument, which, however fallacious, they can use with greater effect because its author was an *avowed* Christian, and at the last a distracted suicide.

The present popular geological theory of the vast age of the earth has been so bolstered by the works of certain clergymen, who have made geology a specialty, that it is with diffidence that I class it as conspicuous aid to the cause of modern infidelity; not that I am in any doubt as to my own position, nor in any fear of inability to justify it, but because I am reluctant to appear as against them; yet I must, for my own perusal of modern infidel works persuades me they have greatly subserved the purpose of the enemy. Assuming the theory as indubitably true which assigns millions or billions of years to the age of the earth, the reverend geologists have attempted to show two things—namely, that the six days of creation spoken of by Moses do not mean six days at all, but six periods of indefinitely long duration; or, as an alternative, that millions or billions of years have intervened between the first and second verses of the first chapter of Genesis, in which worlds upon worlds have been built up and broken down, out of the *débris* of which our present earth was constructed at some time or other.

Thus an author speculates :

“As an ivory ball may be seen, not only in public museums but in private collections, within another ball, and within this there may be a series of balls, enclosing a minute central ball; and as each successive ball from the central one to the outermost may be carved by a rare ingenuity, so that each one may

be of a different pattern, we may here find a resemblance to the earth. The surface on which we tread is but the covering of one world; but it is easy to point out, as we descend in its examination from depth to depth, a world within a world, and then another, and another, and another, each one having plants and animals peculiar to itself, until we reach that central world, which is most *probably* a world of liquid fire, and on whose surface can be traced no signs of life." [Probably not!]—*First Week of Time*, p. 40.

"To this original ball there was, at the pleasure of the Creator, at one period, so to speak, an accretion of matter. After continuing this at its surface in a state of fusion for a longer or shorter period, the temperature of the globe would be diminished by the radiation of its heat into the surrounding space. As the superficial part ceased to be fused, it would become solidified; the globe would then have a covering—as an egg has a shell, or an orange a peel—and within would be the matter remaining in fusion.

"On this, in the course, so to speak, of eternal ages, would accumulate the *azoic* strata, in which no life is discoverable; the next accretion would be, in following ages, the *palæozoic* strata, containing the most ancient forms of life; in ages still succeeding, the *mesozoic* strata would be heaped on them, containing less ancient forms; while to these would be added the *omozoic* strata, containing the most recent forms of vegetable and animal life."—*Ibid.*, p. 57.

Very fine theory, only it is not shown to be true. Having ascertained, as they think, enough of the facts of geology, many have set their wits to work in the construction of theories to account for them; but because they have begun with assumptions for these theories, there is not a shadow of justification to be found by the facts upon which they are professedly established. Instead of being established upon logical deductions from well ascertained premises, they are undemonstrated and undemonstrable *assumptions*, resting upon nothing that can afford even a probability within the do-

main of well established geological fact, and this I shall proceed to prove.

Now, I am no geologist beyond the study of books; but this does not prevent me from a thorough comprehension of the system. I believe in practical geology, thankfully accepting all the well attested facts in our learned volumes, whose authors give them with a clearness of descriptive power and with such precision of statement as enable me to do my own thinking, and this was the predestined end in view by the writers. I am, however, well aware that they are impatient of contradiction, as to the matter of theory; and seemingly imagine that because they have furnished the facts they must furnish the theory as well, and that all who accept the one must hold to the other. This may be pardoned in the enthusiastic who do the hard work of laborious research, but it is intolerable in those who, within arm-chairs and indulging in dreamy ideal constructiveness, which they mistake for profound speculation, and strangers alike to the handle of the geological hammer and to the practical toil of geological explorers, presume to tax others with inconsistencies, who are as well qualified as themselves to judge as to what is truth. Thus Dr. John Pye Smith, an arm-chair geologist, fretfully says:

"It must appear a very strange thing that the persons who have given such distinguished proof of their general ability, and of their acuteness of penetration in this particular department of scientific study; who possess the resources of those auxiliary sciences which are the best grounds in physical inquiry, and the most stern checks upon sanguine minds, to guard them against precipitance or inaccuracy in drawing conclusions; it must appear a strange thing that such persons should labor under an

obliquity of judgment so peculiar and so obstinate that they cannot see the just conclusion from premises which they have obtained by so much expense of time and fortune, of mental and bodily toil."—P. 176.

To this lugubrious complaint the reply is found in the various, variable, and conflicting opinions notoriously found in treatises which have been published to enlighten the people on this subject. Geological facts, like any others, may surely be taken as facts, and made the ground of reasoning by those who reject what they think they can prove unwarrantable inferences from them, as well as by those who accept them as the basis of sound principles. Suppose I should find, far down in the strata, a bone of a foot long, with a fossilized lump, big as my fist, of curious appearance, with protrusions like the prongs of a molar tooth, and with the description should furnish my solemn opinion that by the evidence of comparative anatomy this bone must have been part of a human under-jaw ; and this lump, something like a quid of tobacco, which some unfortunate pre-adamite Brobdignag was chewing when suddenly submerged by an execrable vomit of mud from a volcano ; must you accept my *theory* because you credit the *facts* of my finding ? No ; you exclaim, it is wild and absurd. Precisely, and for the same reason I accept the facts, but reject all theories not logical sequences from them, but *assumptions* presented under the color of necessary deductions. What are the assumptions ? In addition to those already specified, they refer :

(1) To the *sources* whence the materials of the strata of the earth's crust were derived.

(2) To the *nature* of the forces by which they were borne down from primeval granite mountains to their present position.

(3) To the *operation* of those forces, in the arrangement of the strata, as uniformly found; and

(4) To the *fossil remains* of vegetables and animals entombed within them.

Thus there are four sources of argument from which theoretical geology derives its fallacies for the vast and unimaginable age of the earth, which I shall point out in the sequel, as briefly as I can, to show that their general argument fails to establish their theory, and that they have not proved that the age of the world is more than six thousand years, while these theories meanwhile confute themselves.

In order to sustain these theories, geologists must *prove* not only that the materials of the strata were actually drawn from the sources to which they refer them, but that they could come from no other sources. They must *prove* that they were borne down and arranged in a horizontal position by these forces acting, as they say, with no greater energy than that by which they now act not only, but that these forces could not have acted differently or with greater energy at any time than at the present day. They must *prove* that vegetable and animal life could have been supported under different circumstances than those now found essential to their existence. If they cannot verify their theories by such proof arising from the facts themselves as shall show that we are necessarily shut up to the adoption

of them, it will be manifest that no regard can be claimed for them as truthful presentations of rational cosmogony. But, hitherto, *no such proof has been furnished*. Their assumptions are not justified by the facts themselves. They are speculations, and not deductions; and not only so, but their inferences as to the immense ages required for the formation of the strata are not drawn from their facts, but from hypotheses as to the causes and processes of the separate formations of these strata, and the supposed long periods of inactivity intervening between the times of their superposition. It is then obvious that Mr. Miller's predicted battle is ridiculous rather than serious; and if we can show that the theories to which we have referred are inconsistent with the facts themselves, incompatible with the laws of nature, and self-contradictory, then this threatened battle will appear more absurd than ridiculous.

For myself, I may be permitted to say, that were I compelled to accept either of these theories, logical consistency, as I view it, would drive me from the Mosaic record into some quagmire of skepticism, and I can therefore sympathize with many of our youth who, by these means of instruction, have been not only unsettled in the biblical principles of an early religious education, but have become the victims of our modern infidelity. Nearly thirty years ago, Dr. King, of Glasgow, in his book on geology, holds the following language: "In my intercourse with young men of good education, I have found more of them disquieted in

their minds, if not unsettled in their religious principles, by the results of geological investigation, than by any other difficulties attending revealed truth." He witnesses to a fact of common occurrence all over Christendom where these theories have been commended to the confidence of Christians by such works as I have had occasion to notice. Thousands probably have been thus driven from their confidence in the scriptures, not by avowed infidels, but by men who, though Christian ministers, have written to show that we need not be disturbed even if Moses be convicted of not telling the exact truth in the first of Genesis, and of absolute and needless misstatement in the seventh chapter!

Such cases are multiplying, and where does the responsibility rest? I am therefore alike within the limits of my profession and of my duty in an attempt to expose the mischievous fallacies that underlie the theories spoken of, and productive of such sad results.

Rev. Prof. E. Hitchcock, in the *Biblical Repository* for 1835, wrote as follows:

"The principles of geology have long since been regarded not only as hostile to Revealed Truth, but as favorable to atheism—and the geologists must indeed confess that a number of their ablest writers, some time ago, such for example as Hutton, did intentionally or unintentionally give a quite atheistical aspect to some of their most famous theories. And some of them, at the present day, exhibit in their works so entire a neglect of every allusion of a religious character, as to excite pain in every pious mind, and lead many to the conclusion that geology must be the favorite resort of irreligion. Under such circumstances, it will not do for geologists to deny the irreligious tendency of their favorite science, unless they can show positively that it contains

principles of a contrary tendency. We propose to undertake the task."

This was written nearly fifty years ago. Have matters mended with regard to the "tendency" aforesaid, in consequence of the work of the worthy professor and the labors of others who think with him on this subject? Let the scientists of our day answer. So far from it, I shall show that their works, while containing much that is valuable for the purpose proposed, have nullified it all by conceding all that infidelity cares to demand; so that for all practical effects the cause of Revealed Truth has suffered by their well-meant, but ill-timed and sadly mistaken efforts. All the so-called "principles" which they lay down as confirmatory of Revealed Truth, are denied more stoutly now than ever by infidels, who refer to the history of geology as "the favorite resort of irreligion," and claim that Christian geologists have confirmed them in their position.

The first chapter of Genesis begins a literal history of literal facts, without any figure of speech to ornament its language, which is not the less scientific on that account. Out of the general statement that "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," others flow, unfolding the process of successive creations. The second verse of that record is linked on to the first by a *copulative* conjunction, which is used as a *link* at the beginning of all the verses narrating creative acts. Thus we have a chain of facts not broken, but linked on to the first one specified—"In the beginning God made the heaven"—which does not

necessarily mean the whole of the universe, but the orbs within reach of the naked eye, and subsequently spoken of with regard to their relations to our earth, which was brought into being enveloped in total darkness. Now the *beginning* of this work can no more be separated from its immediate continuance, as indicated by the copulative, by any supposable intervening arrangements and disarrangements, than the end of it can be referred to any period of time subsequent to its declared completion. The very *first* recorded act of creative power brought into existence the earth in total darkness, and the immediate *second* act was the creation of light, which God called DAY; and therefore was not of any other quality than solar light, because nothing but this can make day. And when Moses said, "the evening and the morning were the first day," he must be held as saying that the first half of the day was the period of the first darkness that rested upon the face of the deep when the first creative act occurred; otherwise Moses must be held as having contradicted himself in the record of the moral law, in which we find this language: "In (or within) six days the Lord made heaven and earth" (which must mean the heaven and earth of Gen. 1). Each day's work, then, began in the evening, or first twelve hours of darkness, and was completed at the close of the morning, or first twelve hours of light. It is the obvious intent of the historian to date every work to the day of its performance. All that preceded the morning of the first day belonged to the work of that day; therefore Moses in-

cluded the matter of the first verse in the statement of the first day's work, according to the written form of the moral law.

"The earth was without form, and void." That our present identical earth is meant cannot be denied, and the succession of day and night proves that it then revolved on its own axis as it does now. When God said, "Let there be light," this fiat does not indicate the creation of the body of the sun, for its existence was cotemporary with that of the earth, by the first creative act; but it was light itself, sunlight, let in upon our globe; hence it was called *day*; for no other light is of the same quality or can produce the same effects. "The day is thine, the night also is thine: thou hast prepared the light and the sun." (Ps. 74: 16.)

The next creative act produced the atmosphere by which the light should be evenly distributed, and heat as well. It was of course a luminous expanse, and evaporation then would make clouds, to the upbearing of which the atmosphere was indispensable. This great circumambient body of air is also necessary to the operation of life and to the visibility of things. God called the atmosphere Heaven.

Upon the third day He gathered the waters into seas, and caused the dry land to appear—not bare rocks, but productive land—which he called earth, and stocked it with the various forms of vegetable life in maturity and progressive growth. The land was thrust up from the water by an act of Omnipotence, and was diversified with mountains, valleys, and plains much in the same way

as now. The laws of nature cannot be accredited with this wonderful effect, because they were not yet established, and their Great Author was alone competent to work on so grand a scale, and thus he prepared the earth for the great variety of animal life he was yet to bring at once into maturity of being.

On the fourth day the creative act was expended upon the sun, moon, and other bodies; and upon the adjustment of the earth to them; so that they should determine days and nights and seasons, in all their variableness, over the entire earth, in making it everywhere fit for the production and sustentation of vegetable and animal life. The sense is quite obvious: "Let the luminaries [for such is the original] in the firmament of heaven for dividing between the day and the night be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years: let them be for light-bearers (Heb.) in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth. And it was so. And God made the two luminaries—the greater for ruling the day, and the lesser for ruling the night, *with* the stars also." The creative acts of this day were for astronomical adjustments to the uses required by the earth.

On the fifth day the various forms of animals peculiar to ocean and air were spoken into being.

On the sixth day were made the animals peculiar to the land, and the culminating act of the whole was the creation of man.

Such is the simple, clear, unembarrassed statement of Moses. "These are the generations of the

heavens and the earth when they were CREATED, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." Now, when the divinely-inspired historian wrote this wonderful history, he wrote that he might be understood; but the Hebrew people, for whom he immediately wrote, well knew that the word day, inclusive of night, meant a period of twenty-four hours. God called the light *day*, and they had no other term of language by which to designate a solar day, and everywhere in their scriptures it is so used and must be so understood, unless otherwise indicated. To suppose then that Moses used this term with any other sense than that which he knew they naturally and necessarily must put upon it, to imagine that he employed it in a *figurative* sense, when he knew they must understand it in a *literal* sense, in a simple narrative of plain facts, where no figure of speech is found, is to accuse him of unfaithfulness as a historian and of duplicity as a man; when, upon every consideration, there could have been no motive for either. No one can help seeing this, and no one can avoid the conclusion that, if Moses so wrote, then there is, by the inspiration of God associated with the dishonesty of his instrument, rottenness in the very foundation of revealed truth, and rottenness pervading the whole structure as well. Infidels are not slow nor slack in perceiving and using the advantage given them in this particular. By the history it is plain that creation began with the first creative act during the evening or first half of the first day; then the primeval darkness

was chased away by the second act, which was the creation of light; and that light was denominated day; and that this term must have meant what it now means is clear from the narrative of the fourth day's acts, where the day is so defined that no question should have ever arisen so preposterous as that which geological theory has originated. An attempt to make it mean a period of *indefinite* duration throughout the first chapter of Genesis, and yet a period of *twenty-four hours* in three verses of the same chapter (14, 16, 18), without any notification of change in signification, is unworthy of serious refutation.

But Mr. Miller says:

"It has been held by accomplished philologists that the days of the Mosaic creation may be regarded, without doing violence to the genius of the Hebrew language, as successive periods of great extent; and certainly, in looking at my English Bible, I find that the portion of time spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis as *six* days is spoken of in the second chapter as *one* day. True, there are other philologists, such as the late Professor Stuart, who take a different view. But then I find this same Professor Stuart striving hard to make the phraseology of Moses 'fix the antiquity of the globe,' and so, as a mere geologist, I reject his philology."—"I would in any such case at once, without hesitancy, cut the philological knot, by determining that that philology cannot be sound which would commit the Scriptures to a science that cannot be true."—*The Two Records*, p. 24.

It would be hard to find in any competent writer a greater manifestation of self-sufficiency and arrogance. Confessedly ignorant of philology, and not perceiving the difference between scientific principle and arbitrary assumption, he tells the young men of a Christian association that rather than give up his unsupported theory he

would violate the well-established laws of language by which the meaning of it can only be made certain; that rather than believe that Moses fixes the antiquity of the globe, "he would *cut* the philological knot at once, and without hesitation," which ties up the language to such a meaning! What a marvellous exhibit of capability to pronounce an exegetical opinion! What a rare petrefaction of self-complacency! How the infidel applauds such an utterance from the mouth of an avowed Christian! It was a great pity that this greatly magnified geologist had not known something about figures of speech, for in that case he would have seen that the word *day* in Genesis, second chapter, as in multitudes of other places, is used by synecdoche for *time*; a part for the whole. Whenever this figurative appropriation of the word is made, due notice is always given by qualifying terms or phrases. Thus in Genesis 2:4; "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth **WHEN** they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the heavens and the earth." What can be clearer than the indication of the figure of synecdoche by the adverb of time? So in other places, "a day of darkness" means a time of darkness, long or short; "a day of calamity" means a time of distress; "a day of prosperity" means a prosperous time. The term in such connections can never be misapprehended, unless by such interpreters as are accustomed to cut philological knots. The figurative sense unmistakably proclaims itself in all such passages. Wherever the word *day* is found nakedly in any

connection of narrative, without textual explication as aforesaid, it *always* means a period of twenty-four hours. So it stands in the first chapter of Genesis throughout; it can mean nothing else, except where it is clothed with qualifying terms as just shown, and then its use is always by *synecdoche*. I must sift this matter.

While it is graciously admitted that the Almighty was competent to make heaven and earth in six natural days, as it is seemingly affirmed in the record of the Moral Law, and that, consequently, this "theory" involves no absurdity; yet, it is said, since the strata of the earth's crust have been shown to have been superimposed upon one another by the forces of nature acting as slowly as they now do, it is indubitably clear that myriads of ages must have elapsed, in the nature of things, between the time of "the beginning" and the formation of Adam. Hence the Mosaic cosmogony must be brought into harmony with geological science. But this is taking for granted the very thing to be proved. Geological theory is not synonymous with geological science; Moses may be in perfect accord with the latter, and in perfect opposition to the former without discrepancy. They who contend for the aforesaid theory seem to have no suspicion of any possible fallacy lurking in their own argument, and hence they proceed very coolly to violate the very first principle of interpretation, essential to the comprehension of language, in forcing a meaning upon Gen. 1, no less absurd in exposition than it is dangerous to Christian faith and ruinous to the fact of revelation.

Of this there are many examples, out of which, on account of its fulness, I select the argument of Dr. J. W. Dawson, Principal of McGill College, Montreal, as found in his third lecture of the "Morse Foundation Lectures," 1874, to show how utterly unwarrantable such expedients are; and that, upon the supposition of its admissibility, there is no revelation in Gen. 1,—nothing more, nothing better, than allegory and myth.

I only state what is familiar to every one when I say that there can be only two kinds of meaning to a word or sentence, the *literal* and the *figurative*. Every one understands every word or phrase read or spoken by or to himself in its literal primordial sense, unless there be a *figure* expressed or implied. This rule is the first letter of the alphabet, in the science of philology, and it is clearly a rule without exception, because absolutely necessary to our knowing what is meant by words and forms of speech. Especially is this true in a simple narrative of facts. Now the first chapter of Genesis is such a narrative. Simplicity stands out in every sentence. There is not a figure in it. It professes to state naked *facts* during the progress of the creation, and the whole *time* taken in the creation. Every word, therefore, must be understood in its natural, plain, prosaic meaning. It cannot be otherwise understood without destroying revelation, since it can never be known what is meant to be revealed should the above rule be disregarded in the case of a single word, for the obvious reason that if one

word may be put to the torture, so may every other in the narrative.

Dr. Dawson says: "The perfectly indefinite phrase, 'in the beginning,' places no limit in backward extension of time to the commencement of God's creative week. But the six days seem to limit the period occupied in the arrangements of the earth and the solar system." This is clearly an assumption. There is not a single "perfectly indefinite phrase" in the Word of God. Riven out of their natural connections, many may be so called, but they will be miscalled, because unfairly dealt with, as in this instance. Who does not see that it would not exhaust the ingenuity of the materialist to show that this declaration went far to prove the eternity of matter?

He moreover stoutly contends for the meaning of *æon*, or an age of indefinite duration, which the science of geology requires us to attach to the word *day* in Gen. 1; but he seems to have forgotten that the decision of this question belongs to the science of philology exclusively, and that geology has no more to do with it than the science of navigation. He therefore goes on to enumerate all the arguments that have been invented to sustain his view in the interest of theoretical geology, as follows:

"1. The Hebrew word for day does not necessarily mean a natural day. In Gen. 1 : 5 it is used in two senses: the earlier creative days preceded the institution of the natural day; and in Gen. 2 : 4, the whole creative week is called one day."

But this cannot be so, for the following reasons: (1) It is a pure assumption. If the only

Hebrew word for a natural day does not necessarily mean a natural day, then there is no word in that language descriptive of it. So far then as this word is concerned, there is no revelation; because it cannot be certainly known what is revealed by it. (2) If the earliest creative days preceded the institution of the natural day, then the *figurative* use of that term preceded its *literal* use, which is sufficiently preposterous. (3) If the earliest creative days preceded the natural days, and the same word is used with a double meaning without notification, then the Mosaic account is chargeable with gross dishonesty; but if Moses was honest he could not have used language in such a way; and if God revealed facts, it cannot be supposed that he would have allowed his servant to render his revelation ambiguous, and so nullify it by such dishonest writing; and since there is no intimation of difference between "the earlier creative days" and "the natural day," upon the face of the record, the whole thing is a fiction. (4) "In Gen. 2 : 4, the whole creative week is called *one* day," says the Doctor; but my Bible does not read so; it says, "*when* they were created in *the* day," so that the adverb of time with the definite article are purposely used to show that the literal is here supplanted by the *figurative* sense. It is amazing how such a statement could have been made.

"2. Many internal difficulties occur in the hypothesis of natural days. One of these is the interval which in chapter 2 appears to have occurred between the creation of the man and that of the woman. Others arise from the difficulty of replenish-

ing the earth with plants and animals in the course of a few natural days."

But we must not speak of difficulty with regard to God, for "with God all things are possible." (1) The flow of the narrative was stopped at Gen. 2 : 8, for the description of the garden which had been formed for the habitation of man, and resumed again at verse 15; and man was in Eden when woman was formed. No serious difficulty here. (2) The fifth verse informs us that all plants and herbs were produced in full perfection, and did not grow from seed; so of animals, they all sprung into being at the fiat of Jehovah. No serious difficulty here, because God makes instantly the first parentage of all living things, and these generate successors.

"3. In Psalm 90, attributed to Moses, and certainly written in the style of his poetry in Deuteronomy, one day of Jehovah, relating to human history, is said to be a thousand years; relating to creation it must be much longer."

This is an amazing statement, and a very feeble attempt to compel Moses to testify to the modern doctrine of theoretical geology. (1) In Psalm 90 the words of Moses are: "A thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night." Clearly there is not here the remotest allusion to "one day of Jehovah, relating to human history." No such day is said to be "a thousand years;" but the comparison is between a long and a short period, as known to us, to show that there is no *time* to measure God's existence, as it does ours; and therefore not only a day, but a small part of a night is to him what a

thousand years is to man. How any one could so miss the sense of a plain passage is only to be accounted for by an evident great anxiety to make out a case. (2) The following inference will be seen to be simply preposterous: "relating to *creation*, one day of Jehovah must be much longer than a thousand years"!

"4. The seventh day is not said to have had a morning and evening, nor is God said to have resumed his work on the eighth day. Hence the seventh day is the period of man in which we still live. Our Saviour sustains this view of God's Sabbath in his remarkable exposition, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' "

"Ex nihilo nihil fit." Two *negative* premises cannot produce one *positive* conclusion. (1) Because there is no mention of morning and evening to the seventh day, which term is the *same* with that descriptive of the previous six, each of which is divided into morning and evening, that does not prove that it was different from the constitution of the other days. If it did, it would be a bad argument for the geological theory, which requires that each day shall be considered an indefinite time. (2) We are not permitted to work on God's Sabbath. Ex. 20: 10. But if that be the period of man in which we live, and not a natural day, then no man should ever have worked from the time of Adam until now, and no man has ever kept the Sabbath of the Lord! (3) Because God is not said to have resumed work on the eighth day, that does not prove that he did not. Our Saviour says that he did, though the work was of a different kind. "My Father *worketh hitherto*, and I work."

"5. The fourth commandment, as explained by Moses, requires the supposition of long creative days. It cannot be meant that God works six natural days, and rests on the seventh as we do ; but it may be intended on God's seventh day we should have entered on his rest, and that the weekly Sabbath is an emblem of that rest lost by the fall, and to be restored in the future."

The whole of this is no less wonderful than fatal to the theory for whose establishment it is intended. Whoever heard of a plainly written law *requiring a supposition* ? Where has Moses ever "explained" the fourth commandment ? Nowhere ; for the reason that it sufficiently explains itself. Where does he explain it *so as to require* the supposition that the creative days were long periods, or "*æons*" ? Not in the verbiage of the fourth commandment surely. That reads, "Six days shalt thou labor, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," etc., and the reason assigned for rest is this : "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested the seventh day." Now, to say that the seven days *first* mentioned are *literal* days, and the seven days *second* mentioned are *figurative*, or no days at all, but *æons* ; and that, in a legal document admitting of no figure of speech at all ; and that this transition from one meaning to another of the *same* word in the *same* verse, without any notice of it, is to heap dishonor not only upon Moses, but upon God himself, who wrote this law with his own finger upon a table of stone. "It may be intended," I offset with, "It may *not* be intended." One balances the other so far as argument is concerned.

"6. This explanation has the support of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose argument in his fourth chapter has

no force unless on the supposition that God entered into a rest of indefinite duration, which man lost by the fall, retaining only the week's Sabbath as a shadow of it."

Equally unfortunate is the claim that the argument of the fourth chapter of Hebrews is pointless, unless it be allowed that the author of it believed in this theory of geological speculation; for (1) it is nowhere taught that God entered upon a rest of indefinite duration when he ceased from creative work, but just the contrary. Moses represents God as speaking thus (Ex. 29 : 17): "The Sabbath of rest, it is a sign between me and thee;" and then says, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day *he rested and was refreshed;*" or, as it might be rendered, *took breath*. This must of course be interpreted anthropopathically, and is a clear declaration that a period of unlimited duration was not required for his "taking breath" after finishing the creation, and that he rested but for a short time, and then resumed work of another kind, according to the declaration of Christ, "My Father *worketh hitherto*, and I work." (2) The object of Paul in said chapter was not to set forth the duration of God's own period of rest, but to exhibit the nature of that spiritual rest in heavenly happiness of which God was the author, and which he bestows upon the obedient; hence he shows that the rest spoken of was not the rest of the Sabbath, nor the rest of Canaan, both of which the disobedient and gainsaying people of Israel did enjoy; but the rest of heaven, from which the rebellious were excluded. Hence the apostle's

argument is not subject to the aforesaid criticism. (4) This representation strips the weekly Sabbath of the authority of positive enactment in the earlier age, and would make it a mere Jewish institution, and thus by proving too much destroys itself.

"7. There is a good reason to believe that the use of the Greek word *aiones*, with reference to the creative days in Heb. chapter 1, verse 2, and in Ephesians, chapter 3, verse 11, refers to the creative days as indefinite periods, and that these passages should be translated in accordance with this view, while we have this authority for rendering the passage of Genesis 1 by the word *æon*, rather than by the word day."

Thus this famous argument, so strongly relied upon, tapers down to weakness. There is no more authority for translating *yom*, day, by *æon*, age, than for supplanting it by *olam*, the Hebrew for eternity. It is a wonderful assumption, and well deserves the bitter sarcasm of Huxley, which I have quoted, as showing how all such efforts play into the hands of the enemies of Revealed Truth. If the only word for a natural day in the Hebrew language, when first used in Genesis, may mean, not a natural day at all, but an "*æon*," who does not see that the science of biblical philology is an absurdity; and that revelation becomes impossible; since its plainest terms may be made to mean any thing that any ingenious errorist may devise?

Such is the ground for the assertion that *aiones*, in the above passages, refer to the creative days as indefinite periods. Let us see how they read with this substitution. Heb. 1:2, God "hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, by

whom also he made the figurative days, the *indefinite periods*." Eph. 3 : 11, this reads in the common version : "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord ;" but, by the proposed improvement, should read : "According to the purpose of *the indefinite periods* which he purposed in himself." Very fine !

Moreover, if the term day in Gen. 1, may be taken to mean an allegorical day, then the works of each may be taken to mean allegorical works ; because allegory once admitted into a plain descriptive narrative must be allowed to cover the whole of it, and thus Moses would be satisfactorily disposed of in the estimation of Prof. Huxley and his co-laborers. But since there is nothing in the geological strata of the earth, or in any geological fact that can be advanced as unmistakable proof of this theory, it is entirely baseless, because a manifest assumption, unscientific, unphilosophical, unphilological, and absurd.

The author of "The First Week of Time" is an arm-chair geologist, agrees with Prof. Sedgwick, and thus nullifies the day theory (pp. 82):

"It was long since suggested that a day, thus mentioned, *might* mean an indefinite period ; and this notion has been eagerly seized by some geologists (Hugh Miller and others) from a praiseworthy desire to show the accordance of the words of Moses with the physical phenomena of the earth. But, unhappily for them, if the words of Moses be carefully examined, it will be found that none can be more clearly and definitely opposed to such an hypothesis. He says, for instance, that 'God *divided between* the light and between the darkness ;' the word employed denoting an entire separation, as it does when it is said, 'The vail shall *divide* unto you between the holy place and the most holy.' (Ex. 26 : 33.) No separation could be more

complete than that which took place when God *divided* the light from the darkness, or, in other words, separated the day from the night.

“Again, to pass from the Mosaic record to physical facts, will those who speak of a day being millions of years, or a ‘millennium of centuries,’ show us, in the face of nature, that there have been equally lengthened periods of light and darkness? If, in Greenland, where the sun is below the horizon for six months at a time, vegetation is scanty, composed chiefly of mosses and lichens, and animals are few, what would have been the condition of this globe if there had been a period of even six millions of years without the shining of the sun? Where is there, then, from the equator to the poles, and from the present surface to the extremest depth that has been reached, the slightest trace of such a state—a state in which no plant or animal could live? Paleontology lifts up its voice against the vaunted theory, astonishing us, as we have seen, by its details of the abundance and the varieties of animal and vegetable life, and, consequently, by its proof that the day described by Moses is a *natural day*.” “He actually uses it in the same sense in the Pentateuch more than six hundred times; while it is employed more than fourteen hundred times by the other sacred writers.

“From the division ‘between the light and between the darkness;’ from the word expressly employed by Moses to denote a day; from his pointing it out as ‘one day;’ and from his still further describing it as consisting of ‘an evening and a morning,’ it is seen that the period of which he speaks cannot, by any possibility, be an indefinite period or millions of years, but that it is exclusively that precise space of time which is occupied by one revolution of our globe on its axis.”

Mr. Miller’s “muskets and artillery,” therefore, are but formidable names given to harmless toys, and the gunners behind them may stand as long as they please, making faces at the defenders of the Mosaic cosmogony, with their “bows and arrows.” It is all that they can do. Among his “accomplished philologists” is Rev. Mr. Conybeare, of England, like himself, an eminent geologist, who says rather timorously :

"We may perhaps, without real violence to the inspired writer, regard the period of the creation recorded by Moses, and expressed under the term of days, not to have designated ordinary days of twenty-four hours, but periods of definite but considerable length."

And further, that:

"Those who embrace this opinion will of course assign the formation of the secondary strata, in great part at least, to the days of creation; and we have the authority of several divines for such an interpretation."

But, on the contrary, Rev. Prof. Sedgwick, another eminent geologist, declares these divines, and all others of their opinion, guilty of a

"Sinful indiscretion"—"who have endeavored to bring the natural history of the earth into a literal accordance with the book of Genesis, first, by greatly extending the period of time implied by the six days of creation, and secondly, by endeavoring to show that under this new interpretation of its words, the narrative of Moses may be supposed to comprehend and describe in order the successive epochs of geology."—*Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge*, 1833.

Now, let us see what this "sinful indiscretion" amounts to in the service of infidelity. I have a small work in my possession called the "Irreconcilable Records," by "PROF." WM. DENTON, author of "Our Planet: Its Past and Future," in which he gives the names of our Christian geologists who have taken upon themselves the task of reconciling Genesis with speculative geology, and from quotations out of their books has shown that, by their admissions and methods of reasoning, the Bible is a huge falsehood. He has proved that these harmonizers have shown the Bible and their theoretical geology to be hope-

lessly at variance in every particular of the Mo-
saic cosmogony ; so that out of the hands of its
own advocates modern infidelity has received its
most formidable weapons. I have no hesitancy
in saying that if any young man of unsettled re-
ligious principles, and of ordinary intellectual
proclivity to investigation, should read the fair,
common-sense deductions drawn from these so-
called harmonizers, he would, in my judgment,
become a confirmed infidel, without the special
preventing grace of God. These works of Revs.
Dr. Buckland, Dean Conybeare, Prof. Sedgwick,
Dr. Pye Smith, and their cisatlantic coadjutors,
Drs. Hitchcock, Thompson, and others, have done
immense harm and no good by their unfounded
and injurious speculations. It is with profound
regret that I find myself compelled thus to speak ;
but if I speak at all, I must thus speak, because I
have read the arguments of infidelity derived
from their writings, and have met young men so
damaged by these arguments, against which they
could not reply, that they avowed disbelief of the
Bible on account of them. Who does not see that
if Moses, the type of Christ, has falsely stated the
facts of creation, and embodied that statement in
the written moral law, that Jesus Christ, the anti-
type and indorser of Moses, may as reasonably
be rejected? I will not ask any one to take on
trust my unsupported statement as to this matter,
but will quote briefly from the book I have men-
tioned, written in the interest of infidelity. Says
the writer in question :

“The Bible, we are told, is from God. It is all true, all di-

vine ; given to man to be his unerring guide. He who made the universe made this book ; he who wrote his name in blazing suns upon the sky, wrote this Bible, or inspired men to write it, who infallibly recorded what he desired that man should know."

This is represented as the creed of the aforesaid harmonizers, and the author proceeds to show how they make it out. In his notice of Dr. J. P. Thompson's work, "Man in Genesis and Geology," where there is learned speculation about the first words in the Bible, he asks :

"But when was this beginning ? Our modern would-be harmonizer of Genesis and geology assures us that 'there is here no limitation of time, and therefore the expansion of astronomical and geological eons, cycle upon cycle, finds here the most ample scope. There was time enough in that "beginning" for the evolution of the entire solar system from a single nebulous mass,—supposing that to have been the condition in which matter was first produced.' But this gentleman finds it convenient to forget that God himself—taking his view of the Bible—has declared in the plainest possible language when this beginning was. The creation of heaven was the work of the second day,—'God called the firmament heaven,' and we read in Ex. 20 : 11, 'For in *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,' and in Ex. 31 : 17, 'In *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth ; and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.' Whatever heaven and earth mean in the one place, we may reasonably conclude they mean in the other. But if God made heaven and earth in six days, then the beginning, in which he is said to have made them, must be included in those six days ; for if not, then he did not make the heaven and earth in six days, as this passage informs us."

"When we have learned that the heaven and earth were made in six days, we have a key to the time of the 'beginning.' On the last of these six days Adam was created. The time from the creation of Adam to the deluge is sixteen hundred and fifty-six years ; and from that time the Bible furnishes us with dates by which we learn that the deluge took place about forty-two hundred years ago. Then the creation of man took place, according to the Bible statement, less than six thousand years

ago; and 'heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,' were created in less than a week before the creation of man; and this was 'the beginning.'

"But who does not know that this is false? Owen says, very justly, that the age of our planet alone, as indicated by geology, is a 'period of time so vast, that the mind, in the endeavor to realize it, is strained by an effort like that by which it strives to conceive the space dividing the solar system from the distant nebulae.' Dr. Buckland, himself a clergyman of the Church of England, says: 'Many extensive plains and massive mountains form, as it were, the great charnel-house of preceding generations, in which the petrified exuviae of extinct races of animals and plants are piled into stupendous monuments of the operation of life and death, during almost immeasurable periods of time.' Prof. Sedgwick, of Cambridge, England, says: 'During the evolution of *countless succeeding ages*, mechanical and chemical laws seem to have undergone no change; but tribes of sentient beings were created, and lived their time upon the earth.' Prof. Hitchcock, of Amherst, says: 'The globe must have existed during a period *indefinitely long* anterior to the creation of man. We are not aware that any practical and thorough geologist doubts this, whatever are his views in respect to revelation.' No geologist pretends to speak of less than millions of years for the time during which the various formations that constitute the crust of the earth were deposited.

"Nearly all would-be harmonizers of Genesis and geology are now 'compelled' to take the same view (with Miller in his 'Testimony of the Rocks'), and make the word 'day' cover a period millions of years in extent." "On the face of it, an interpretation that makes the word 'day' mean an immense period of time, is strained and unnatural. How could it be said with any propriety or truth, 'In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it,' if each of the six days were millions of years long, and the seventh evidently a natural day of twenty-four hours? Ex. 31:17, must be read to signify, 'In six periods, millions of years long, the Lord made heaven and earth; and on the seventh period, of twenty-four hours long, he rested and was refreshed!' The time of rest is, out of all proportion, small to the time of labor; and why should the same word, used in the same connection, mean

in the first part of the verse millions of years, and in the last part only twenty-four hours? Hugh Miller, in order to escape this difficulty, represents the seventh day as still continuing. 'Over it,' he says, 'no evening is represented in the record as falling, for its special work (of redemption) is not complete.' But the Bible says expressly, God '*rested*,' and God blessed the seventh day, because he had '*rested*,' not rests; and by this rest he '*was refreshed*;' not, he is being refreshed, as it ought to have been, if God's Sabbath still continues.

"Who cannot see that an interpretation of the word 'day,' that involves such an absurdity as this must be false?

"Before theologians were, like Hugh Miller, 'compelled to elongate the Genesical days,' they acknowledged that neither the Hebrew nor common sense would admit of any such interpretation of the word 'day' as they now give it.

"In the early editions of 'Comstock's Geology'—it has been dropped from the later—was the following letter from Moses Stuart, who was Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary of Andover. He was a good Hebrew scholar, and wrote a grammar of that language.

"'The inquiries you make concerning the word *yom*, in Gen. 1, I will briefly answer. It does not signify an indefinite period of time, but always some definite one, when employed, as it is in Gen. 1, in the singular number. It sometimes means a specific day of the week; sometimes *to-day*—that is, this day; sometimes a specific day, or season of calamity, joy, particular duty, action, suffering, etc. It is only the plural, *yamim*, which is employed for time in an indefinite way, as "in many days to come," "days of my life," etc. But, even here, the plural in most cases is a limited one—limited by some adjective, numeral, etc.; often it stands for a *year*. . . . When the sacred writer in Gen. 1 says, the *first day*, the *second day*, etc., there can be no possible doubt—none, I mean, for a *philologist*, let a geologist think as he may—that a definite day of the week is meant, which definite day is designated by the numbers *first*, *second*, *third*, etc. What puts this beyond all question in philology is, that the writer says specifically, the evening and the morning were the *first day*, the *second day*, etc. Now, is an evening and a morning a period of some thousands of years? Is it in any sense, when so employed, an indefinite period? The answer is so plain and certain that I need not repeat it. . . . If Moses has given us an

erroneous account of the creation, so be it. Let it come out ; and let us have the whole. But do not let us turn aside his language to get rid of difficulties that we may have in our speculations.'"

"That is honest, that is manly ; he meets the subject fairly, nor attempts to dodge the responsibilities. Stuart was not, however, a geologist, or he would have known that it was not to get rid of difficulties that Bible geologists had in their 'speculations' that they resorted to this forced and unnatural definition of days, but to get rid of difficulties that facts, incontrovertible facts, presented.

"If each day consisted of an evening and a morning, and a day was a period millions of years in duration, then there must have been a period of darkness about as long as the period of light. How could the plants made on the third day survive this million years' night ? Or if evening and morning mean a period of rest and a period of action, as some have suggested, then there must have been immensely long periods during which nothing was being accomplished. How is it that the rocks furnish no record of them ? And if God rested a million of years between each creative act, what need was there of a seventh-day rest ?

"*'But Hugh Miller harmonized Genesis and Geology.'* If you had said that he had tried, and, failing, put an end to his life, you would have been much nearer the truth."

"*'In the beginning,'* then, was but fifty-eight hundred and seventy-four years ago ; and thus the first verse of the Bible demonstrates that the book has had an entirely false estimate put upon it, and that one of its writers, at least, was entirely ignorant of what he professed to teach."—Pp. 6-16.

Such is the incontrovertible argument by which an unbeliever in Revealed Truth overwhelms the aforesaid theory of Miller for reconciling the Mosaic record with theoretical geology ; and such is the legitimate deduction drawn from this unfortunate assumption, which I repudiate as an amazing perversion of logic. But I shall hereafter show that "the incontrovertible facts,"

spoken of by Mr. Denton as the source of difficulties unmanageable in proving practical geology in harmony with the Mosaic record, are not facts but fictions fallaciously founded on fact. This I propose to do in discussing the matter of the vast age which, we are told, all geologists in common assign to the earth.

Those of them who, like Dr. Sedgwick, think others guilty of "a sinful indiscretion" in making the creative days to be no days at all, but millennia of years, adopt another theory equally objectionable with the one already considered. While retaining the natural meaning of the word day, they say that the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis is an independent proposition, having no necessary connection with the sequel, but simply states the fact of the formation of the heavens and the earth. Between the first and second verses, therefore, they thrust in millions of years. Their theory, however, will not stand, for the following reason :

The second verse is bound to the first by the copulative *vav*, which means a *hook* ; it is used to connect words, to hook sentences one to another ; and, especially in a continuous narrative, never is or can be used in the sense of a *disjunctive*, but always has the meaning of *and*. Had Moses intended to have left room for such an opinion as asserts and inserts millions of years between these verses, he would have left the second verse without a copulative, or introduced it with a disjunctive ; but he has done neither. If it was his intention to exhibit these two verses with the following

ones of the narrative, as so many links of one chain, he could not have done otherwise than insert a *vav* at the beginning of the second and of each succeeding one. This is just what he has done. Every *vav*, therefore, in this narrative of creative acts must be translated AND. Should any one insist that the *vav* of the second verse *may* be taken in the sense of *āch*, *but*, then I insist that every other must be taken in the same sense, by reason of the close continuity of facts; but this would throw the whole into confusion, and is on that account inadmissible. This second theory, therefore, is an assumption equally glaring with the first, and equally incompatible with the principles of philology.

The discoveries of geology are, beyond all question, of an intensely interesting character. To such magnificent volumes as those of Bakewell, Buckland, De la Beche, Dana, and others, in my possession, I am proud to acknowledge my indebtedness. By their lucid instruction, like others of my profession, I can become as good a geologist perhaps, within the walls of my study, as they who, within similar dimensions, have done a much larger amount of geological business on as small a capital. From these explorers we learn that our globe is surrounded by numerous strata of mineral matter, various in quality and thickness, superimposed in a regular gradation, like the layers of an onion, the sum of which is estimated by geometrical measurement from ten to thirty or fifty miles in depth from the surface. Thence to the centre of the earth, nearly four thousand miles, it is by

most of our learned men supposed to be a vast mass of molten rock, which is like a shoreless, bottomless ocean of liquid fire. Many of them think it is solid from the centre, with vast cavities interspersed, some containing this igneous matter in seething agitation, others large reservoirs of gas, and still others, oceans of mineral mud. The vast number of vegetable and animal remains imbedded in these strata contribute to a great fund of thought, out of which theories are formed as to the age and make-up of our little planet. By these theories, geology has been made to appear in conflict with the Mosaic record ; and, in consequence, the instrument of impairing or destroying faith in the science of Revealed Truth. But as there can be no discrepancy between true facts and Revealed Truth, which has been proved long before geology was born, a consistent, harmonious system whose facts and principles correlate in a form of knowledge scientifically exact, the cosmogony of Moses, interpreted by the laws of language, must contain the truth of geology, no matter what theories may say. Upon those who deny it, the *onus probandi* heavily rests. They cannot ask that matters of opinion shall be taken as matters of scientific induction, nor that hypotheses be substituted for principles, from which alone sure and satisfactory knowledge may be drawn. If their deductions be shown to be principles explanatory of facts, in the only rational way in which they can be explained, then geology will assume the dignity of a science whose facts and principles are in correlation ; but if, instead of principles drawn from facts

by an accurate induction, we find them theories based on assumptions, and generalizations drawn from weak, insufficient, obscure, or unmanageable facts, and not upon the plain facts of the strata themselves, then geology has no higher claims than geography or topography on the score of science. Let us see.

Geologists are at variance among themselves as to several matters upon which there should be no disagreement in a "science," *e.g.* :

1. Whether the world was begun as a body of gas or as a body of fire?
2. Whether the days of creation spoken of in Gen. i, were literal days or æons?
3. What is the origin of limestone, rock-salt, and other minerals?
4. What were the processes of formation in the various kinds of primary rock?
5. How were the strata laid, and why the order of them rather than some other?
6. What were the causes of mountain upheavals and the dislocations of the strata?
7. What time or times elapsed during the formation of each and of all the strata?
8. What were the causes and sources of material of the coal measures?
9. When did vegetable life commence, and how long before animal life began? etc.

Whatever diversity of opinion may exist among geologists upon other matters, there is one upon which, we are assured, they all agree, namely, that the formation of the strata composing the crust of the earth consumed an immense period,

even billions of years; that the phenomena of dislocations, upheavals, and faults, are referable to such forces as are now producing changes on the surface of the earth; that these forces, mechanical and chemical, with the action of gravity, fire, and water, have ever exhibited the same intensity of dynamic agency; and that no geological events can be regarded as having taken place in any other way than according to the *same* MEASURE of rapidity and power with which they are now known to work. This last is regarded as a fundamental principle, upon which all their reasoning is founded.

“We assume,” says Prof. Dana, “that the forces in the world are essentially the same through all time for these forces are based on the very nature of matter, and could not have changed.” “The laws of the existing world are consequently a key to the past history.” “They are the active forces and mechanical agencies which were the means of physical progress—spreading out and consolidating the strata, raising mountains, ejecting lavas, wearing out valleys, bearing the material of the heights to the plains and the oceans, enlarging the oceans, destroying life, and performing an efficient part in evolving the earth’s structure and features.” “These agencies are held to have had no more power toward determining the directions of progress in evolution, than they now have in determining the course of progress in development.”

While this is thus acknowledged to be an assumption, and nothing more, it cannot be held to be an established principle, argument from which will lead to reliable truth in results. Nothing in the strata can be assigned as evidence that they were originally laid in a horizontal position and subsequently broken up by these forces acting

with no greater violence and rapidity than they now exhibit. The evidence appears all the other way, if the Noachian Flood be admitted, and if we may argue from the great number of extinct volcanoes found in all latitudes, and also by the prodigious upheavals of mountain ranges all over the earth, and the wild confusion into which its strata have been thrown. To attribute these and many other results of evident violent action to the *measure* of force now exerted by the uniformly acting forces of nature, surely is not reasonable.

But even if this assumption be admitted to the dignity of a principle, it will be found fatal to the cosmological theories which are built upon it. Many distinguished geologists hold that the first form of the earth was a vast body of gas, which finally, after ages of chemical activity, was reduced to a globe of fire, or of molten matter in fiery billows. But this, too, is an assumption having no evidence to rely upon in the strata themselves; for our knowledge of all sorts of gases teaches us that they are evolved out of solid material, and not solid material out of them. When subjected to a pressure equal to the weight of a column of water 1230 feet high, and at 32° Fahr., carbonic acid gas is liquefied. Is there any known agency by which that form of it can be retained when the pressure is taken off? I think not. So of other gases. If these chemical laws have always acted as they now do, what becomes of this theory? It is utterly baseless. In the beginning God made the earth, but he did not make gas out of which the earth was formed by the laws of nature or by

miraculous agency. Nothing exists in the make-up of the earth from which such an inference can be scientifically drawn. Gas may lie latent in solid matter, out of which it is generated under certain conditions by chemical forces, but we know of no condition of the gases that allows those forces to produce solid matter out of them. This theory is therefore contrary to the laws of matter no less than to the Mosaic record, and is unscientific and absurd.

But there is a large number of geologists who, while ignoring the gas theory, hold another quite as objectionable. They tell us that the earth was formed an igneous mass of molten matter, which by the laws of nature assumed the form of a globe rotating upon its axis; and in the process of ages its surface cooled, forming a crust of granite over this molten mass, the form of which proves that in its original condition of a fiery, billowy ocean, it was an oblate spheroid; otherwise the crust could not have been enlarged at the equator and flattened at the poles; that this crust was ridged and diversified by huge, high granite mountains and granite plains; that after an immense lapse of ages, mechanical and chemical laws, acting as they now do upon matter, disintegrated them by particles, so that they were all abraded, worn away, and worn down into comminuted sand or coarser detritus; and thus borne down to the plains and ravines, were carried by rivers and streams into the great cavities of the crust containing the oceans and seas, over the bottoms of which these mountains of granite, having been pulverized by

the laws of nature acting as slowly as they do now, and with their well-known ordinary force, were thus universally spread out ; and thus was formed the first stratum that overlaid the floor of the primeval crust. Then a long period of rest must be allowed for this first stratum to be sufficiently consolidated by the superincumbent oceans before another period of commotion, by which another set of mountains, of different mineral quality, should be thrown up, to be worn down in the same way, and to be superimposed as the second stratum. Omitting all the alleged particulars which modified each world-production through eras of submergence and emergence as were incident to them, suffice it to say that stratum upon stratum from successive piles of mountains, belonging to successive worlds, were thus superimposed in a horizontal position, until the last one formed, when, at some time or other, by a tremendous convulsion or successive convulsions of nature, all these strata were torn up from the bottom and dashed into the utmost confusion, the granite of the first being thrown up into our present mountain ranges, carrying with it the matter of the other strata curved upwards, and otherwise deflected, *without breaking*, into all angles of inclination, and in many places commingled into masses of rocks, detritus, gravel, and various qualities of earth, yet so that we may arrive at sure conclusions as to the details of the cosmogony, the outline of which has now been given from their own descriptive volumes.

Now, if all this amazing statement of physical

facts, conditions, and agencies be a true representation of the past history of our globe, then beyond all doubt millions and billions of years, more or less, must have intervened between the time of the beginning and the formation of the present world out of the débris of former worlds; and Moses is not to be believed, because either from ignorance or design he withholds every item of this interesting detail; and not only so, but gives a clearly false statement, connecting the beginning and the end within a period of six days, for it is indubitable that the earth of the second verse of Genesis 1, is the identical earth of the first verse of the chapter made in the beginning; and since he further declares in the written moral law that in six days God made the heavens and the earth, there is no escape from the conclusion that he represents our earth to be a creation when it was only a reproduction out of the matter of old worlds, which had been in existence, with light, atmosphere, and vegetable growths necessary for the lives of the huge animals now extinct, whose fossil remains are found in the older strata. This theory of the formation of the earth out of the ruins of old worlds, that had been illumined and in all respects fitted to sustain vegetable and animal life, is admitted by Christian geologists who claim to have reconciled the Mosaic record with it. Thus Dr. Buckland, in his *Bridgewater Treatise*, says :

“ Assuming that the whole materials of the globe may have been once in a fluid or even a nebular state, from the presence of intense heat, the passage of the first consolidated portions of

this fluid or nebulous mass to a solid state may have been produced by the radiation of heat from its surface into space; the gradual abstraction of such heat would allow the particles of matter to approximate and crystallize, and the first result of this crystallization might have been the formation of a shell or crust, composed of oxidated metals and metalloids, constituting various rocks of the granite series, around an incandescent nucleus of melted matter heavier than granite.

“The detritus of the first dry lands being drifted into the sea and there spread out into extensive beds of mud and sand and gravel, would forever have remained beneath the surface of the water, had not other forces been subsequently employed to raise them into dry land (again).

“Whenever solid matter arose above the water, it became exposed to destruction by atmospheric agents by rains, torrents, and inundations, at that time, probably, acting with intense violence, and washing down and spreading forth in the form of mud and sand and gravel, upon the bottom of the then existing seas, the materials of primary stratified rocks, which by subsequent exposure to various degrees of subterranean heat became converted into beds of gneiss, and mica slate, and hornblende slate, and clay slate. In the detritus thus swept from the early lands into the most ancient seas, we view the commencement of that enormous series of derivative strata which by long-continued repetition of similar processes have been accumulated to a thickness of many miles.”

All this, we are told, *may have been*, but then it *may not have been*, and so nothing is proved. It is easy to slide out of assumption into assertion of fact, but there is a wide difference between them.

The same supposable facts are “assumed” by Macculloch, who says :

“The first condition of the earth which has been inferred is that of a gaseous sphere; while it is my business to state that the only evidence for this is derived from the analogy of comets, itself rather more inferential than proved, as far as the study of these bodies has hitherto proceeded. But it must also be said as corroborative of such an inference, that the laws of the radia-

tion of heat, and those of chemical combination, do *permit* the needful inference that such a sphere *might* or *must* finally become a fluid ; or at least a fluid globe." "The first apparently solid globe was, therefore, a globe of granite, or of those rocks which bear the nearest crystalline analogies to it."—Vol. ii., pp. 416, 417.

"I have drawn the conclusion that there was one terraqueous globe, one earth divided into sea and land, even *prior to that last named*, containing mountains to furnish and an ocean to receive those materials which formed *the second set of mountains*, whose fragments are *now* embedded in our *primary strata*, or in those of a third order."—Vol. i., p. 464.

Prof. Hitchcock, adopting these views, says :

"The whole period occupied in the deposition of the fossiliferous rocks must have been immensely long There must have been time for water to have made depositions more than six miles in thickness, by materials worn from previous rocks, and more or less comminuted ; time enough, also, to allow of hundreds of changes in the materials deposited, such changes as now require a long period for the production of one of them ; time enough to allow of the growth and dissolution of animals and plants, often of microscopic littleness, sufficient to constitute almost entire mountains of their remains ; time enough to produce, by an extremely slow change of climate, the destruction of several entire groups of organic beings ; for, although sudden catastrophes may have sometimes been the immediate cause of their extinction, there is reason to believe those catastrophes did not usually happen till such a change had taken place in the physical condition of the globe as to render it no longer a comfortable habitation for beings of their organization. We must *judge* of the time requisite for these deposits by similar operations *now* in progress, and those are in general extremely slow."

Thus it will be seen that he fully endorses the speculations that began with transatlantic geologists, but has exceeded them in one particular ; and that is in reference to *light*, which he thinks was not created when God said, "Let there be light ;" but was only reproduced or called out of

a *latent* state in previous matter of old worlds which had absorbed it. He further says:

“From the facts which modern science has developed as to the existence of light and heat in all bodies, we can hardly imagine that these were not created in the beginning *along with matter*. But these facts show us that they might have existed without being visible, or that having been visible during ages, they might have been absorbed into matter, and that it required the power of Almighty God to develop them to such an extent as was necessary to the new state of the earth; that is to say, it was rather a recreation than an original production of light that is described in the third verse” (of Gen. i.).

What kind of light was *invisible* light, or how, after shining for a while, could light be “*absorbed* into matter”?

Who does not see that this is a point-blank contradiction to the Mosaic record? If, when God said, “Let there be light, and there was light,” the meaning be simply a reproduction of what had been in existence and operation ages before, then every other fact of the Mosaic record must be held to have been a reproduction and not a new creation. What more of concession do infidels need to demolish the foundation of the Mosaic record, with every thing built upon it? What a sweeping process they may now boast of! What an admirable expedient is this to reconcile the Mosaic record with theoretical geology! What an enlightened opinion, suggesting how *it might be* that sunlight, having existed for ages for the eyes of the Trilobite and of various other animals, and for vegetable growths, was put out, like a candle, when the old world went to its sleep of death; or was *absorbed* into the darkness of mat-

ter, no matter how ! Where is the intelligent infidel that would not clap hands over such a brilliant harmony of statements, as apparently antagonistic as truth and falsehood ?

To bring Moses into sweet accord with theoretical geology, the *assumption* of the latter must forsooth demand that, in spite of philology, billions of years shall be thrust between the first and second verses of the first chapter of Genesis ; and then an affecting appeal is made to all the adherents of Moses, by Dr. Hitchcock, who, after enumerating his points, says (*Religion of Geology*, p. 60):

“ Let this imperfect summary of evidence in favor of the earth’s high antiquity be candidly weighed, and can any one think it strange that every man who has carefully and extensively examined the rocks in their native beds is entirely convinced of its validity ? Men of all professions, and of divers opinions concerning the Bible, have been geologists ; but on this point they are unanimous, however they may differ as to other points in the science. Must we not, then, regard this fact as one of the settled principles of the science ? If so, who will hesitate to say that it ought to settle the interpretation of the first of Genesis in favor of the meaning which allows an intervening period between the creation of matter and the creation of light ? This is the grand point to be established.”

But that it can never be established by such incoherent reasoning as this is as clear as noon-day, for

1. He lays down a hypothesis in reference to the existence of the world in some sort of a state previous to the Mosaic account, which is inconsistent with natural law, and for which there is not even the ghost of a proof.

2. He next theorizes about the formation of the strata of the present world and of the débris of old broken-down worlds, and finally pronounces it a *fact*.

3. This *fact* becomes forthwith a *principle* of the science, and then

4. This principle becomes an established law of exegesis, and then

5. This law does not explain the text at all, but settles the matter as to how millions of years may be thrust between the first two verses of it!

No wonder that Prof. Huxley stands by, complacently stroking his chin, while he utters his sarcasm, "I have carefully abstained from speaking of this as a Mosaic doctrine, because we are now assured upon the authority of the highest critics that there is no evidence whatever that Moses ever wrote this chapter, or knew any thing about it." It is just by such assumptions of scientific profundity that many ministers of the Word of God and Christian laymen have been frightened into silence upon this subject, lest they might be pitied as unscientific, weak, bigoted, and utterly behind the age.

De Luc says, in his "Letters," p. 46:

"The circulation of systems of natural history contrary to the Mosaic revelation has been greatly extended by representing them as wholly unconnected with Christianity, the certainty of which, it is said, is independent of that of the Jewish religion, or, at least, of the first chapters of Genesis—an assertion which even a number of Christian ministers have been made to believe. It is thus that a great number of individuals have allowed themselves to be carried away by pretended natural science, without being aware of its tendency; that it has become

a kind of fashion; that its general results, exhibited as demonstrated propositions, have been circulated through all classes of society; and that, at length, the greater part of those who pretend to any information are fearful of incurring the charge of ignorance if they do not side with those who consider the first of our sacred books as a fiction."

All rational men will admit that nothing is so unphilosophical as the denial of facts because we cannot explain how it is that they are constituted facts; but it is not unphilosophical to deny theories advanced to explain them, when shown to come short in the very particular upon which their competency depends. When facts are collected for scientific observation, their probable causes are first sought for; and then hypotheses are laid for appropriate explanation. To verify such hypotheses, as containing explanatory principles which must ultimately take their places like the strong timbers of scientific framework, men must succeed in showing that they cover all the facts collected and collated, and have become bonds of union by which facts are harmoniously classified and relatively understood. Many Christian men of acknowledged ability have issued works like those I have named, taking for granted that the theoretical geology which assigns billions of years to the formation and perfection of the earth, is a truthful representation of the physical facts belonging to its history; but infallibility is not claimed for the loftiest human genius that ever burst into sky-rocket brilliancy; and for that reason, every volume that ever issued from the hands of men may be questioned in some particulars of its process. Now, if the theory under

consideration can be proved to have reduced its hypotheses to explanatory principles, taking in all the facts collected, then we have nothing to do but to accept it; though in the acceptance we must let Moses go as an uninspired historian, whose alleged physical facts cannot be accredited; since it is demonstrably impossible to reconcile his cosmogony with the prevailing theory without destroying the science of philology, and the very basis upon which a verbal revelation from God to man is at all possible. I think that can be made to appear as clear as light.

But if the works in question, like that of the author of "The Pre-Adamite Earth," written by talented and good men for the very best of purposes, be found not only to come short of their aim, but to be injurious in their influence, if not anti-Christian in their tendency, there is no virtue shown in the neglect to counteract them, so far as it may be done by exhibiting the facts of their failure and of their injury done. Infidelity has increased notoriously and prodigiously just within the period during which these books have been written advocating the theory in question; and this is the more remarkable, because within no other has gospel effort been so wisely and so efficiently concentrated. There is a sure cause for this anomaly, and to me it seems to be obviously lurking in the circulation of such works as subordinate the foundation facts of the Bible to what is claimed to be the facts of geology ocularly demonstrated, and clearly incompatible with the former as they

stand upon the face of the inspired record ; and this opinion, allowed to pervade the church and the world unchallenged, has had a controlling influence with the leaders of public sentiment ; and infidelity has been encouraged in its efforts, and has largely succeeded. This will account for the fact, by the evidence of the literature floating over the religious portions of the world touching this matter, within the last fifty years or more.

That my position with regard to this theory, as utterly insufficient to sustain what is laid upon it, is right, I may be allowed to show from geologists themselves. Prof. Huxley says in his second lecture on "Evolution," in New York :

"We have taken into consideration that important fact so well insisted upon by Lyell and Darwin—the imperfection of the geological record. It can be demonstrated as a matter of fact that the geological record must be incomplete, that it can only preserve remains found in certain favorable localities and under particular conditions ; that it must be destroyed by processes of metamorphosis—by which I mean that beds of rock of any thickness, crammed full of organic remains, may yet, either by the percolation of water through them, or the influence of subterranean heat (if they descend far enough toward the centre of the earth), lose all trace of these remains and present the appearance of beds of rock formed under conditions in which there was no trace of living forms. Such metamorphic rocks occur in formations of all ages, and we know with perfect certainty when they do appear that they contained organic remains, and that these remains have been absolutely obliterated."

Speaking of rocks traversed by cleavage, in which there have been movements and rearrangements, perhaps when in a semifluid state, De la Beche says :

"There have often been elongations in those directions, so that any organic remains contained in the beds become distorted, and seem as if pulled out."—*Geo. Obs.*, p. 621.

However careful competent observers may be, it is quite evident, from these and other facts already spoken of, that they are liable to fall into great mistakes in their processes of deduction, and so advance claims that will not bear the test of close investigation.

I propose more fully to show, in my next lecture, that the claims of theoretical geology are unfounded; and that Moses does not need these efforts of our Christian geologists to preserve his character as an inspired historian from ruin.

LECTURE V.

THEORETICAL GEOLOGY AND THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY.

Practical Geology not in conflict with the Science of Revealed Truth—Quotation from an infidel author—The prevailing Theoretical Geology irreconcilable with the Mosaic account in seven particulars—Irreconcilable with the Scriptures in four particulars—Contrary to the laws of nature—Theoretical absurdities in World-formations—Inferences no proof—Argument from fossil remains answered—Universality of Deluge denied—Arguments against it answered—Quotation from an infidel author—Only three theories possible—The true one indicated—Geology not a science having principles peculiar to itself—The Bible and Christianity ask no favor, but demand a fair decision upon evidence—The only hope.

IF our Christian geologists in their publications had aimed to adjust geological theory to the long and well established Science of Revealed Truth, as they might have done with ample success, instead of attempting to show how the Bible may be brought into harmony with geological theory, they would have worthily accomplished a good work ; but strangely overlooking this, and assuming common ground with materialistic and pan-

theistic geologists in their speculative opinions about the unthinkably great age of the earth, they have so expounded the scriptural history of creation, as to excite the derision of infidelity, thus confirmed in its opposition to the Bible, by a method which only goes to show that harmony is impossible; and to shake the faith of the bewildered believer who has relied upon his Bible with childlike confidence. Unfortunately, they concede that Genesis 1, literally interpreted, does not say what its consecutive verses evidently seem to say, but that the facts referred to, and the times of the facts, are entirely different from the representation of plain history as related by Moses without any figure of speech whatever. Consequently, there is no revelation. The use which infidelity legitimately makes of this, may be well imagined; but not trusting to imagination, I will give an example taken from Mr. Denton's book, already referred to.

“If the account of creation given in Genesis is false, then the commandments said to have been given to Moses on Mount Sinai, which endorse that account, never came from God; and the Pentateuch is a merely human production, of no more authority than the account of creation itself. But with the Pentateuch, away go all the Old Testament books, for they endorse it, and argue from it. It is impossible that the spirit of truth could have inspired men to build upon and endorse the terrible falsehoods of the Pentateuch. But, when the Old Testament is gone, how much of the New remains? Jesus appeals to the Old Testament, urges his claims on the strength of its statements, and the evangelists and apostles everywhere recognize its authority, as fully as our orthodox ministers do to-day. All that we can do, then, in the light of absolute fact, is to accept the Bible only as the statements of men, in many cases lamentably

ignorant of what they pretend to teach, and of no more authority than the writings of Mohammed or Joseph Smith."

Such is the argument fairly drawn from certain works, purporting to reconcile the Bible with geology. The very way by which the authors have conducted their discussions, leaves an abiding conviction that, in their judgment, Revealed Truth, literally taken in the statements of its own foundation facts, is irreconcilable with geological truth demonstrated by its own indubitable facts, which, according to them, no well-informed man can gainsay; therefore, the Bible needs to be exegetically adjusted to the claims of their theoretical geology to preserve its character unimpaired. Thus a writer says: "We are come to where four cross-roads meet: for, first, we must deny the geological facts and inferences; or, secondly, we must give up the popular interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, and reconcile the facts to the sacred text by a new one; or, thirdly, we must deny that the Bible touches at all upon the question; or, fourthly, *we must give up the inspiration of the Bible as to its physical statements.*" We hope to show that this is a mistake.

The theory, assigning to the age of the earth millions or billions of years, was in the outset a wild *assumption*, wholly uncalled for and unnecessary to account for geological phenomena; but Christian geologists have contributed to confirm it as unquestionably true, in the minds of many depending upon their perspicacity, and who accept it because these learned men, while revering the Bible, insist that either the days of Genesis 1, are

not days at all, but *æons*, each of which may have embraced millions of years, or that the first verse of Genesis must be held to stand so completely apart by itself, an independent absolute proposition, as to allow these billions of years to have elapsed before the facts announced in the following verses could have taken place; hence, while many Christians feel they must accept it, their confidence in all literal biblical fact is somewhat, more or less, shaken.

Speaking of himself and colaborers, Professor Hitchcock says :

“ We occupy stations where it becomes our frequent duty to explain the principles of geology to those who are in a course of public education. After we have given them fully and fairly the facts of the science, they will inevitably draw the inference, if we do not, that vast periods of time must have been occupied by all the changes that appear to have taken place among the rocks. We must, therefore, meet the question fairly, whether such an inference conflicts with the Mosaic history. And we know, too, that some able geologists would be quite willing to have such a discrepancy made out. Now should we take the ground that the rocks were not formed by secondary causes, but instantaneously by the power of God, with all their organic contents, or that they were deposited by ‘ partial floods and earthquakes, and successive ones,’ between the creation of man and the Noachian deluge, or by that deluge, we are quite certain that we could not defend ourselves against these infidel geologists, in the view of those who are acquainted with the science. If, on the other hand, we maintain that the words of Moses do not admit of any other interpretation than the common one, in respect to the age of the world, this is just what gratifies the infidel; for he feels sure that we thus virtually acknowledge discrepancy between the two records. But if we contend that Moses’ words admit of a construction consistent with geological principles, then many of our Christian brethren regard us as doing injury to the sacred cause of religion. In such a dilemma, what can we do?”—*Bib. Rep.*, 1836, p. 486.

But, by contending for the plain meaning of Genesis 1, as it stands out upon the face of the record, there is no necessity for getting into such a dilemma. In the matter of instruction, geologists not only give "the facts of the science," but the *theory* as well, which is founded upon the *assumption* of Mr. Lyell, that the same causes which are now operating on our globe have always operated in the same manner and measure as they do now. This is a pure assumption, destitute of all proof from the strata themselves, contrary to the evidence of thousands of extinct volcanoes, and advanced only for the purpose of sustaining the theory of the vast age of the earth. Whoever teaches this, as a well-ascertained fact, teaches a great error, and may make up his mind that he cannot induce any respectable student to accept it as compatible with the inspired historical record of the Bible, whose words clearly mean the exact ideas necessarily created by their native signification in a plain narrative of facts. Mr. Lyell was one of those able infidel geologists who "are quite willing to have such a discrepancy made out," and, no doubt, they who adopt his assumption as a "principle," will find it impossible to go against his conclusions. Christian geologists, by avowing that the words of Moses will not bear any other than the literal interpretation, so far from gratifying infidel geologists, would confound them simply by requiring *proof* instead of assumption, that the book of nature contradicts the written book of God. But by contending that Moses' words admit of a construction consistent

with the doctrine of the vast age of the earth, Christian geologists become an easy prey to the infidel on the score of argument, because they sacrifice the essential principles of philology to a supposititious theory; and thus contribute to the strength of the adversary; and to the damage of their own avowedly superior science—that of Revealed Truth.

Now let us see what are the details of the argument claimed to be decisive in favor of the vast age of the earth. Dr. Hitchcock gives it in all its fulness. He says that it is important to ascertain whether this demand for such indefinite periods of time be really called for by the established facts of geological science, and proceeds to give his decision in the affirmative for the following reasons (*Bib. Rep.*, 1835, pp. 262–264):

“1. More than two-thirds of existing continents are covered with these fossiliferous rocks; which contain numerous remains of marine animals, so preserved as to prove incontestably that they died on the spot where they are now found, and became gradually enveloped in the sand or other stony matter which accumulated around them, their most delicate spines and processes being preserved. In fine, these rocks present every appearance of having been formed just as sand, clay, gravel, and limestone are now accumulating in the bottom of the ocean, by a very slow process. Except in extraordinary cases, indeed, it requires a century to produce accumulations of this kind, even a few inches thick.”

But this is no reason for the belief spoken of, because it is only an opinion, a statement of facts which may be true, or may not be true; but whether true or not, cannot affect the question about the age of the earth, since these remains

might have been the result of a swift process ; in short, an "extraordinary case" of the extinction of animal life by a liberation of noxious gases with an outpouring of "stony matter" from the bowels of the earth. Nothing is proved one way or another about the vast age of the earth.

"2. Geologists think they have ascertained that the fossiliferous strata in Europe are not less than eight or ten miles in thickness. How immense the period requisite for the production of such vast masses !"

But, surely, what geologists *think* about their ascertaining a fact, is a very different thing from proof of a fact ascertained. But supposing that they are right in their conclusion as to this point, how does that settle the question they raise about the vast age of the earth? Bakewell says that eight miles of its crust in thickness bears about the same relation to its body that the coat of varnish does to the artificial globe covered by it ; and if it be ten times as thick, how easily might a corresponding stratum have been evolved out of the body of the earth within a period of a hundred years or less, by the agency of mud volcanoes, submarine, and all over the land. So long as this may be shown an opinion quite as rational as the one indicated, his second reason for the vast age of the earth is as irrelevant as the first.

"3. This mass is divided into hundreds of distinct strata, or groups of strata ; each group containing peculiar organic remains, and arranged in as much order, one above another, as the drawers of a well-regulated cabinet. Such changes show that there must have been more or less of change of circumstances in the waters from which the successive strata and groups were deposited. And such changes must have demanded periods of time

of long duration, for they appear to have been for the most part extremely slow. We hence derive confirmatory evidence of the views that have been presented concerning the vast periods that have been employed in the production of the fossiliferous strata."

All this proceeds upon the assumption that it is a well-established fact, that the same causes that are now operating on the earth have always operated in the same manner and measure as they do now; than which nothing is more unlikely, because the evidence is all the other way, as above indicated. Besides, it is here taken for granted that each stratum was derived from the comminution of mountains worn away by the action of atmospheric forces, and the débris slowly borne down by rivers and freshets, and spread out over the bottoms of the oceans and seas, thus requiring new sets of mountains and rocks, consecutively thrown up, to be consecutively worn down in the same way, and thus superimposed one upon the other like the layers of an onion; but this is another assumption, an impossibility by the laws of nature, and an impossibility upon the supposition of the truth of the first assumption. Hence this reason is utterly insufficient.

"4. Another circumstance still further confirms these views. In very many instances, each successive group of the strata, above referred to, contains rounded pebbles derived from some of the preceding groups. Those strata, then, from which such pebbles were derived, must not only have been deposited, but consolidated and eroded by water, so as to produce these pebbles, before the rocks now containing them could have been formed. It is impossible that such changes, numerous as they must have been, could have taken place in short periods of time. There must certainly have been long intervals between the formation of the successive groups."

But it must here be taken into consideration that the strata have all been broken up, and thrust through, and upon one another by some convulsion subsequent to the times of their superposition. No argument then, such as this, for the vast age of the earth, can be derived from the different ages allotted to different groups of pebbles. It is impossible to disprove the following assertion, that a thousand years of commotion in the ancient oceans was time amply sufficient for the formation of all manner of pebbles in the crust of the earth, provided their rotund formation be due to oceanic action. But this is a question. Bakewell says: "Satisfactory solutions to all these inquiries (about pebbles) will probably long remain desiderata in geology, though, in some instances, we can arrive at a high degree of probability, by referring to causes in present operation." The present theory about pebbles involves greater difficulties than it explains, and therefore no inference can be drawn from it for any thing, much less for the great age of the earth.

"5. The history of the repeated elevations which the strata have undergone conducts us to the same conclusion. Different unstratified rocks have been intruded among the stratified ones of various epochs, and the strata have been elevated at each epoch. . . . Here, then, we have the same evidence of the slow formation of the stratified rocks as is taught us by their lithological characters and their organic remains."

This declaration is founded upon the assumption aforesaid as to the sources of the strata, which not only involves an absurdity, but exhibits one in the pictures of the strata which geologists draw for

the elucidation of their works. As an evidence of the vast age of the earth, they *tell* us how one set of mountains and high lands were worn away and carried to and spread over the bottoms of oceans, and hardened into stone, upon which, after many ages, another set of mountains were disposed of in the same way ; and thus the several strata were formed which compose the entire crust of the earth ; but in their pictures they *show* us how a mountain of granite, for example, has been forced up through all these strata, which, instead of breaking them to atoms, carries them upward upon its sides in curved lines, as though they had been as yielding and adhesive as strata of soft mud. Thus we have the strata, represented in many engravings, bent upwards, in curvatures of parallel lines, or angular, or eccentric, without any breakage. From this source, therefore, there can be derived no evidence for the vast age of the world. In further confirmation of this, I may state that in the coal formation large stems of trees, from thirty to eighty feet high, have been found standing nearly at right angles to the soil out of which they grew. Now, to suppose that these would last through long ages of accumulation, until the strata should slowly reach the top of them, is to accept an evident absurdity.

“6. Finally, there appear to have been several almost entire changes of organic life upon the globe since the deposition of the fossiliferous rocks began, and comparative anatomy teaches us that so different from one another were the successive groups which we find in the different strata, that they could not have been contemporaries. . . . But they lived long enough for rocks, thousands of thousands of feet in thickness, to be deposited,

which now contain their remains. Who can doubt that vast periods of time were requisite for such changes of organic life? and who can believe that they have taken place since the creation of man? We have dwelt thus long upon this point because of its importance. For if there is not the most conclusive evidence in geology of the existence of the globe longer than the common interpretation of the Mosaic history admits, we need not surely spend time in reconciling the two records."

But appearances are deceptive, especially in view of the many accidents, such as the percolation of water, distortion, and obliteration, which befall some of these remains. The argument from comparative anatomy is here of little value, but supposing all these remains to be so complete that there is no danger of mistake, how are these remains to prove the great antiquity of the globe? If these rocks were originated, as they must have been, by sudden eruptions of mineral mud, with noxious gases, from the bottom of the ocean, in periodical successions, who does not see that vast numbers of fish and other marine animals, with vegetable growths, would be speedily and immovably fixed in the elementary formations of these strata? The fact is, if theoretical geology be true, a greater multitude of these remains ought to be found, both of sea and land, embedded within these rocks. There is, therefore, no proof of the vast age of the earth derivable from the remains entombed in the strata. The pretence is founded on the false theory as to the sources whence the strata were derived. The assumption that the surface of the whole globe, in the first instance, was solid rock, is absurd, as I

shall show ; there is no proof that any more of it was surface rock than that proportion now found.

Such is the evidence offered us that the world is older by immeasurable ages than the Mosaic cosmogony implies, but there is not an item of it that will sustain that proposition ; on the other hand, it is weak and vapid, because not derived from the *facts* of geology, but from *opinions* advanced to account for the facts.

I now propose to show, that this theory is altogether contrary to the details of the Mosaic cosmogony ; contrary to every other passage of the Bible treating of this matter ; contrary to the laws of nature, and inconsistent with geological fact. If these points be made clear, another thing will also be shown, namely, the amazing fact that theologians, who admit all the facts correlating with the principles of biblical science as accurately given in literal historical description by the pen of inspiration, still hold that they must be modified, in spite of the laws of philology, by a theory founded on *assumption* ; and, as I shall show, in essential conflict with them, when another theory lay obviously open for adoption not so embarrassed. To this I shall briefly allude in the sequel.

I. The theory now sought to be made the standard of truth, to which Moses' account must be reconciled some way or other, is contrary to the inspired details of the creation.

(1.) The Bible says: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void ; and darkness was upon

the face of the deep." Here the term earth, repeated in close proximity, must denote the same identical thing; but this theory denies it, saying that the first-named earth means one separated by billions of years from the second-named earth, which may or may not be the one we inhabit. That the sun shone brightly upon the first-named earth, but an accumulation of clouds so thickly enveloped the second-named earth that the then long-before existing sunlight could not pass through; hence the "darkness" which enveloped this earth, which was not a new creation, but a new formation out of the old material. There can be no reconciliation here.

(2.) The Bible says, that on the *first* day God spoke *light* into being; but this theory denies it, saying that sun-light was shining ages before, by the requirement of vegetable and animal life, whose existence in long continuance is proved by the fossil remains found in the strata of broken-down worlds. There can be no reconciliation here.

(3.) The Bible says, that on the *second* day God made the expanse of the atmosphere, which he called heaven; but this theory denies it, maintaining that this heaven existed ages before, for the same reason that required sunlight, and for the support of the thick clouds of darkness that enveloped a reproduced earth, through which the light of the sun could not penetrate. There can be no reconciliation here.

(4.) The Bible says, that on the *third* day God created vegetable life; but this theory denies it,

affirming that the strata of the earth contain demonstrations to the contrary in the fossil remains of such enormous growths as required the forcing of sun-light and a heated atmosphere, without which they could not have lived. There can be no reconciliation here.

(5.) The Bible says, that on the *fourth* day God set the sun in the heavens for a great luminary to adjust day and night, seasons and years; but this theory denies it, asserting that the sun had performed these offices for ages to previous earths, and that on the fourth day, he only cleared away a fog. There can be no reconciliation here.

(6.) The Bible says, that on the *fifth* day God created animal life peculiar to the waters; but this theory denies it, because the fossil remains of extinct species of fish are found in the strata of older worlds.

(7.) The Bible says, that on the *sixth* day, God created animal life peculiar to the land; but this theory denies it, for the same reason; and asserts that life was at this time only a reproduction of what had existed ages before. There can be no reconciliation here.

Thus, there is a continuous contradiction which lies out of the sphere of all possible harmony. If this geological theory be true, the Bible is false; if the Bible be true, this theory is false; and they can no more be reconciled than darkness and light can coexist in the same room.

II. This theory is contrary to every other passage of the Bible treating of the matter.

1. The Bible says, Ex. 20 : 11, " In six days the

Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is;" but this theory says he made neither heaven, nor earth, nor sea; neither in, nor at the time specified; for they had existed ages before; nor did he make all things in them; for a vast mass of vegetable and animal remains are found in the strata of this world, whose living forms belonged to a previous world. There can be no reconciliation here.

2. The Bible says, Mark 10 : 6, "*From the beginning* of the creation, God made man male and female;" but this theory denies it, saying that creation began billions of years before man had an existence. There can be no reconciliation here.

3. The Bible says, Heb. 1 : 10, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth;" but this theory denies that our earth, which is the earth spoken of, was founded in the beginning; but a different one in which huge animals and reptiles roamed. There can be no reconciliation here.

4. The Bible says, Heb. 11 : 3, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear;" *i.e.*, the visible world was not made of pre-existent matter; but this theory says in opposition: "Through science we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were made out of things that do appear;" that is, out of pre-existent matter. This is a flat contradiction; and the contradiction is so complete throughout, that it is as impossible to

make the Bible and this theory speak the same language, as it is to bring the voice of a mule in accord with the tones of a harp.

III. This theory is contrary to the laws of nature, which it assumes to have operated as they *now* do from "the beginning." According to it, our planet, in the beginning, was a molten globe of liquid rock from centre to circumference, holding its globular form by gravitation, and, because rotating upon its own axis, was enlarged at the equator and flattened at the poles. In process of time, its surface, by radiation, cooled down so as to form a thin granite crust evenly over the liquid mass, which, by cooling, was contracted; and by contracting was squeezed up into lofty mountains, high hills, and formed deep chasms and extended plains, all of the same quality of unstratified or crystallized rock. This radiation, extending far out into surrounding space, produced a hot atmosphere into which masses of vapor were received and ultimately returned in rain. This accounts for the first water, alternating between the states of vapor and rain until, at length, the surface became sufficiently cold to retain it in its cavities. Hence, the first oceans, seas, and rivers. Thus an author informs us :

"The first rugosities, the first ridges were formed on the surface of the globe, which possibly afforded the first hold for the action of water, the precipitation of which took place, without doubt, long before the temperature of the terrestrial crust had descended to 212° of Fahrenheit's thermometer, in consequence of the pressure exerted by the vapor then diffused in the air. From that moment waves produced débris and arenaceous matter, and sediments began to form. Probably the water, at a high

temperature, charged with the principles disengaged from the solidified masses, like lava of the present time, attacked the stony matters, disintegrated and dissolved them, and subsequently formed chemical deposits, or consolidated the débris."—*Ruschenberger's Elements of Geology*.

Such is the theory. But it is unphilosophical, and strangely in conflict with the laws of nature. It is granted that gravity then acted as it now does, and it is maintained that every law of nature then conditioned and controlled matter as it now does. Lyell says that, "the forces formerly employed to *remodel* the crust of the earth were the *same in kind and energy as those now acting*." (Principles, pref.) It is, therefore, granted that geologists do not assume any ground of induction for the occurrence of any event in the formation of the globe that is not directly shown in the present position of the strata, and that they cannot assume any geological event to have happened, except such as has sprung from the chemical and mechanical forces to which they attribute their formation. Keeping this in view, we shall see that their account of cosmogony is utterly preposterous, because it is in continuous violation of the laws of nature, and by their own principles, destroys itself.

Now, I maintain that it is, under these circumstances, impossible that such a crust of granite as this theory speaks of, could ever have been formed over a surging mass of liquid rock 24,000 miles in circumference, or more; because the one is impossible to the other, and for this reason: fusion, or a melted state, is a *secondary* condition of matter and presupposes solidification. If, then,

the chemical force of heat, which is the cause of fusion, was in operation upon the matter from the beginning, this fusion was a primary and not a secondary condition of it. To suppose that the world was *formed* in a state of fusion from centre to circumference involves two absurdities: first, that the Creator produced an immediate stupendous effect independent of the force created for the cause of that effect; and secondly, that such an effect could be produced by a dynamic cause, operating at the present rate of its force. If the skeptical geologist deny creative power, then the theory supposes a vast effect to rise from an obviously inadequate cause; or, rather, from no cause at all.

Mr. Bakewell, an eminent geologist, says:

“The greatest depth to which the geologist can extend his observations from the uppermost strata to the very lowest beds that have been raised up or laid bare by the natural operations that have formed mountains or valleys is less than eight miles: a thickness which compared with the bulk of the earth does not exceed that of a coat of varnish upon an artificial globe.”

“If the earth be composed of a solid crust or shell surrounding a fluid mass, this internal fluid would be subjected to the attraction of the sun and moon, or in other words would have its regular tides. We are not acquainted with any counteracting influence to prevent the impulse of these tides upon the solid shell.”

Now nothing can be clearer than this: Such a crust, comparatively so thin in formation, could not have resisted the internal surging tidal action, which would not only have prevented it from solidifying into rock, but by the force of pent-up radiation would have burst it into millions of

fragments. These, being heavier than the liquid below, would have been submerged only to be remelted. Added to this, the radiation of such fierce heat into all contiguous parts of the atmosphere would have caused a mighty universal tempest by a rush of wind from the surrounding regions, thus making the formation of such a crust forever impossible until the molten globe had cooled from centre to circumference. How is it that the gentlemen who so complacently sneer at Moses, did not see and avoid this blunder in world-making? And how is it that our Christian geologists gravely take it as a perfectly satisfactory theory so clearly proven that the Mosaic account must by all means be made to agree with it?

This theory further supposes that, in consequence of the enormous radiation, immense masses of vapor were formed in the surrounding air from which at length all the water came. But it is an absurdity, because contrary to the law by which vapor is formed, as we know by experience. How could our philosophers have so strangely forgotten their own rule, that they do not assume any event to have happened except such as spring from the laws of nature as they now act? Vapor is a condensation of watery particles exhaled mainly from the ocean by the heat of the sun; but this theory reverses the whole operation, and, before any ocean existed, produces vapor enough from nowhere to make all the water upon the face of the modern earth, by radiation not from the sun, but from the

liquid fiery globe into the air, where there was not a particle of moisture; radiation and vapor both at the same time from the same source, which by the condition of things could not be! What a miracle is here! The conversion of water into wine by Omnipotence, at which infidels laugh, was nothing to it; for that was only the impartation of the qualities of one liquid to another; but this is creating all the water of the globe by means of enormous masses of vapor gathered into the air, under circumstances which made it an impossibility. Surely, no infidel can now find fault with miracles on the score of absurdity. What a beautiful theory it is! How scientifically constructed, and how wisely adapted to show the origin of water filling the cavities of the impossible crust just spoken of! Who can help admiring the depth of penetration by which the sad mistakes of Moses have been exposed, which for so long a time have misled men into the belief that he told the literal truth!

This marvellous theory accounts for the formation of the various strata of the *modern* earth in this wise. The granite crust aforesaid was covered with mountainous ranges and various elevations of this kind of rock upon which the winds and storms of centuries beat with the same force they exert now, and thus abrasions were slowly made until, by the dissolving action of mechanical and chemical forces, continents with their mountain masses of granite were all comminuted into detritus, sand, gravel, and coarser stuff, and washed down into rivers which carried

them to the oceans just as is done now, where they were spread out over the bottom thousands of feet thick, and compacted by the weight of the superincumbent water; this formed the granite stratum which is the first in the series, and uniformly covers the globe. The primeval world, thus broken down by the abrasion of chemical and mechanical forces then acting with no greater energy than they do now, and submerged beneath the waters, was permanently solidified by internal heat and external pressure into granite rock again; forming an immensely thick floor for subsequent deposits of materials of different qualities of rock through long periods, borne down, in like manner, from successive upheavals of mountain ranges and extended plains, all worn down in a similar way. Unimaginable ages were necessary for this result. But who does not see that such a theory is simply an *inference*, not derived from any thing in the strata themselves, but from a pure assumption as to the sources whence the strata were derived, and the methods by which they were comminuted and deposited in a horizontal superposition? This assumption is moreover based upon another, equally unwarrantable: that the chemical and mechanical forces of nature, acting as they now do, were adequate to such stupendous effects. But is this justified by our knowledge of such forces? We may ask, what appreciable diminution have they wrought upon naked granite within the memory of man? None at all, and what then becomes of the theory that whole continents of

granitic mountain and plain, and subsequently others taking their places by upheavals of gneiss and mica-schist of secondary formation, were thus reduced successively to the condition of sand, and laid one over the other by the aforesaid forces acting with no greater measure of strength and rapidity than they do now? We say it was impossible, even if it were demonstrated that those successive piles of consecutive mountains had existed; but that they did exist, is the thing to be proved, before any such argument can be formed from their comminution. Until it be demonstrated that such mountains must have existed by evidence found in the strata themselves, geologists cannot fairly ask that their theory shall receive any respect; for supposititious premises can only produce supposititious conclusions. Such then is the *condition in which their logic lies*.

In further support of the theory in question, and maintaining that the earth we tread is not a new creation but only a reproduction out of old material, geologists say, that in the strata of previous wrecks are found the fossil remains of enormous animals, the living like of which are nowhere found on this earth; and also of vegetable growths of gigantic size. Their existence demonstrates the co-ordinate existence of light and atmospheric influences as a necessity to it, hence they must have belonged to races extinguished along with the light and atmosphere of previous earths on which they lived. Thus Rev. Dr. Buckland says:

"The enormous thickness and almost infinite subdivisions of the stratified rocks, with the numerous successions which they contain of the remains of animals and vegetables differing more and more widely from existing species as the strata in which we find them are placed at greater depths ; the fact that a large proportion of these remains belong to extinct genera, and almost all of them to extinct species that lived, and multiplied, and died on or near the spots where they were found, shows that the strata in which they occur were deposited slowly and gradually during long periods of time, and at widely distant intervals. These extinct animals and vegetables could, therefore, have formed no part of the creation with which we are immediately connected."

But this is an assumption not at all necessary to account for these fossil remains, and involves a fallacy which Dr. Buckland himself shall expose. Granting the facts in the case as to the extinction of many species of huge animals, such as the mastodon, mammoth, ichthyosaurus, plesiosaurus, and others, we have a few respectably large ones left, such as the elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, and crocodile, the fossil remains of whose ancestors are found in the *same* strata with those of the extinct species above referred to. This fact is fatal to the theory I am opposing, for if that were true, not a living specimen of the latter should be now found upon the face of the earth. They all should be extinct. But since this is not the case, the latter living species afford indubitable proof that they belong to the same kind and the same earth once inhabited by the former extinct animals ; for our huge animals are the descendants of their contemporaries ; and this shows that the strata entombing the remains found in them, belong to the Adamic world, and not to the wreck

of any pre-Adamite earth. That there is no mistake about this matter, is clear from Dr. Buckland himself, who says :

“It appears that the animal kingdom was early established on the same general principles that now prevail ; not only did the four present classes of vertebrata exist, and among mammalia the orders of pachydermata, carnivora, rodentia, and marsupialia, but many of the genera into which *living* families are distributed were associated together in the same system of adaptations and relations which they hold to each other in the actual creation. . . . The bones of all these animals found in the earliest series of the tertiary deposits are accompanied by the remains of reptiles, such as now inhabit the fresh waters of warm countries, e.g., the crocodile, emys, and tryonix. . . . The second or miocene system of tertiary deposits contains an admixture of the extinct genera of lacustrine mammalia of the first or eocene series, with the earliest forms of genera which exist at the present time. . . . The third and fourth or pliocene divisions of the *tertiary* fresh-water deposits abound in extinct species of pachydermata ; for example, elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, and horse, *together with the extinct* genera mastodon. With them also occur the first abundant traces of the ruminantia ; for example, oxen and deer.”—*Bridg. Treat.*, pp. 87-90.

In the Lower Silurian group of rocks, which is next to the lowest of all, are found various kinds of fish.

In the Upper Silurian, *fish* and *reptiles*.

In the Old Red Sandstone, *fish*, *reptiles*, and *birds*.

In the Lias, *fish* and *huge reptiles*.

In the Lower Oolite, *fish*, *reptiles*, *birds*, *insects*, mammalia.

In the Upper Oolite, *fish*, and particles like the roe or eggs of fish.

In the Wealden, great variety of *saurians*, *tortoises*, and *land-animals*.

In the Chalk, *marine remains*, some *reptiles*, and *shell-fish*.

In the Eocene, the remains of *extinct* and *living* species.

In the New Pliocene of the more recent Tertiary strata, the *mammoth*, *mastodon*, *hippopotamus*, *rhinoceros*, *tiger*, and other carnivorous animals.

These relics of animals, and others of vegetables as well, discovered in the early strata, not long since, were said to have had no existence until numerous ages after those strata had been formed. Sir Charles Lyell held that not less than thirty thousand years must have elapsed between the age of the mastodon and that of the introduction of man; but all this is now proved untrue. In the Swabian Alps numerous human skulls have been discovered intermixed with the bones of the mastodon and of other huge animals. There were, therefore, no distinct ages of fishes, birds, reptiles, and beasts, chronologically separated from each other by vast lapses of time; but their remains are found in rocks formed subsequent to the time of their extinction, according to the romancing theories of geologists; and mammalia are found in rocks said to have been formed before they lived, and also in rocks after they had become extinct.

Thus, it appears, there has been an unbroken perpetuation of species from the first of animal life, as found in the early strata, down to the present day. But this fact, as given by Dr. Buckland, is fatal to his own doctrine of primeval world-wrecks. Beyond doubt, all animals of the

same species had a common parentage. There could not have been any intermediate links lost out of the chain, for it is an absurdity to suppose that the fossil remains of two independent animal creations could coexist in the same strata, having the same anatomical structure, and yet have no relation in the same line of succession. To suppose that one became extinct in an age millions of years before the other existed and yet the remains of both be found in the same strata, is a wonderful premise for as wonderful a conclusion. The megatherium was a huge creature, now extinct, but faintly represented by our sloth. The frog of our waters is the small end of a noble ancestry, the squatting individual of which rivalled in size the bulk of a recumbent ox, and has little place in human regard, except among the French, who doubtless regret the sad degeneracy ; but yet he is a living, leaping argument that the huge animal and the small both belong to the same batrachian order, though to different periods of the same earth. From a large and varied examination, Agassiz says : " These facts furnish as direct evidence as we can obtain, in any branches of physical inquiry, that some, at least, of the species of animals now existing have been in existence over thirty thousand years, and have not undergone the slightest change during the whole of that period." All similar opinions are equally valuable, because proceeding from naturalists equally honored ; but equally valueless, because all drawn from the *same* source in the strata, and all alike contradictory to the Mosaic cosmogony.

It is, therefore certain, that whatever may be the supposable inconsistencies found in the Mosaic record, the "scientific" theories of the world's formation are infinitely absurd. To suppose that it was formed in a state of gas or of molten rock, over which, by the laws of nature, operating as they now do, a crust of granite was formed the first eight miles of whose thickness is in the proportion of a coat of varnish to an artificial globe, is a proposition which evidently confutes itself. It is evident that within such a fiery mass no forces could have existed to have propelled upwards the vast mountain ranges of granite said to be by abrasions worn down to sand and other comminuted matter, and carried by rivers or cataraacts to cover evenly or otherwise the bottom of all oceans and seas, and thus become layers of evenly distributed matter superimposed upon each other in a horizontal position all over the globe. Such an assumption is destitute of all probability, because it is in conflict with those very laws of matter, which they admit operated in the beginning as they now do, and have always done; and in utter conflict with the facts which they are said to explain.

Passing by other points, which time will not allow me now to discuss, I wish briefly to notice another matter in which our Christian geologists have given aid to the enemy, and that is the Noachian Flood.

The history of this catastrophe is recorded by Moses in a lengthened description, and in language so precise as to make it forever impossible that

we can interpret him otherwise than as stating the fact of a strictly *universal* deluge. On the supposition that that was his design, we can form no additional terms of phraseology that could render it more apparent in the following inspired account :

“ And the flood was forty days upon the earth ; and the waters increased, and bare up the ark, and it was lift up above the earth.

“ And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth ; and the ark went upon the face of the waters.

“ And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth ; and all the high hills, that *were* under the whole heaven, were covered.

“ Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail ; and the mountains were covered

“ And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man :

“ All in whose nostrils *was* the breath of life, of all that *was* in the dry *land*, died

“ And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven ; and they were destroyed from the earth ; and Noah only remained *alive*, and they that *were* with him in the ark.

“ And the waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days.”

This history has long since been a matter of profane scoffing to infidels of every grade, from the most polished to the most scurrilous of their writers ; but their arguments have been so often shown to be grounded on objections from ignorance, and not on objections from knowledge, and so utterly failing to account for a universal tradition remarkably uniform in its main ideas of this matter, that they had ceased to be of any importance to the infidel in this controversy, until the subject of geology furnished new theories for debate.

Some geologists claim that they have shown there could have been no such thing as a universal deluge, since man has been upon the earth. This meets with the hearty applause of all infidels, but how much more are they elated when Christian geologists adopt the same view, contending for a *partial* deluge, which infidelity had no interest in denying! The Scriptures represent that the deluge was caused by the immediate interposition of the Moral Governor of the world, for *moral* reasons which imply the necessity of its being made universal; accordingly, they say, in the most unmistakably general terms, "*All* the high hills that were under the *whole* heaven were covered. Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered. And *all* flesh died that moved upon the *earth*, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beasts, and of creeping things, that creepeth upon the earth, and every man; *all* in whose nostrils was the breath of life, and of *all* that was in the dry land died, and every living substance was destroyed which was upon the *face of the ground*, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth; and Noah *only* remained alive, and *they* that were with him in the ark." Now it is impossible to escape the conviction that Moses meant all that such varied terms of universality crowded together can mean in the enunciation of bare fact, except by a perverse effort of a mind pledged to sustain a contradiction at all hazards.

This catastrophe was brought about for moral

reasons, but by secondary causes, whose arrangement for the purpose was in preparation by the punitive hand of God for the space of one hundred and twenty years. Yet Dr. Pye Smith, with others, denies the universality of the deluge; contending from his geological prepossessions that it was local, and but of limited extent, occurring in the country immediately surrounding the first abode of Adam's race; and his objections are substantially the same as those which infidels long before him had advanced. But it is passing strange that he did not see the insuperable difficulties which begirt his hypothesis. He says:

"If, in addition to the tremendous rain, *we suppose* an elevation of the bed of the Persian and Indian seas, or a subsidence of the inhabited land toward the south, we shall have sufficient causes, in the hand of Almighty Justice, for submerging the district, covering its hills, and destroying all living beings within its limits, except those whom divine mercy preserved in the ark."

To this the infidel replies that he will not quarrel with *any* supposition, so long as the universality of the deluge is given up. In that case, not only the inspiration but the truth of the Bible must be given up also; only, he suggests a few things that put their Reverences into a ridiculous position, who adopt this theory to save themselves from assuming the ground of open infidelity. Thus, say they: If the deluge was circumscribed within a particular district, comprising all the human race then existing, what was the necessity of taking a hundred and twenty years to warn them of a calamity which they might have escaped with-

out repentance, by simply moving out of the district? Repentance, therefore, was not necessarily an alternative to destruction; and, anyhow, would not those who fortunately lived on the outskirts of the district have been sure to escape after the flood began to rise? Then, again, what was the necessity of Noah's long labor in building the ark, since he had only to remove beyond this fated district, even if he should have had to accomplish a journey of some two thousand miles to the Himalaya Mountains? He had one hundred and fifty years to do it. God could as easily have gathered samples of all animals in that district into a caravan for that safe elevation. Since Dr. Pye Smith says, "that for the honor of God and the interests of genuine religion, it is our duty to protest against the practice of bringing in miraculous interpositions, to help out the exigencies of arbitrary and fanciful theories," why not make a clean thing of it, and get rid of the Ark altogether, with its impossible burden of beasts, and provender for a whole year? Consistency would seem to require it.

Now there can be no rational answer to this, which will not involve our Christian geologists in greater confusion; I refer, of course, only to those who maintain the theories heretofore spoken of. The triumph on the score of argument is clearly on the side of infidelity.

Thus, too, Dr. McCausland writes (*Builders of Babel*, pp. 9, 10):

"The Mosaic narrative of the Flood was considered as recording that all the dry land on the face of the earth had been sub-

merged beneath the waters, and that the overflow had carried destruction to every living creature, from east to west, and from pole to pole, with the exception of Noah's family and the few animals that were with him in the ark. The knowledge of later days has corrected our notions in this respect, by showing that such an occurrence as a universal submersion of the dry land could not have taken place within the last six thousand or even sixty thousand years; but there are indications that a partial, though, in itself, an extensive subsidence and submergence did probably take place in the country surrounding Ararat and the Caspian Sea, at no distant period of time, destructive, of course, to all the animal creation within its sphere, unless so far as some may have been preserved by human exertion. . . . Accordingly, it has been shown that the Hebrew text of the record of the flood does not represent and necessitate a belief that the Noachian deluge was more than a partial or local catastrophe, or that it prevailed over any part of the earth's surface more extensive than that occupied by the race of Adam at that early period of their history, and destroyed them, with the exception of Noah's family, and the comparatively few species of the animals with which they were surrounded in that country."

With regard to the philological exegesis of the passage, I say, from personal investigation, that a greater mistake and misstatement than the above were never made in the way of explanation. The "Hebrew text of the record of the Flood" both *presents the fact, and necessitates the belief*, that the deluge was universal; for it would be impossible to employ stronger phraseology to express that fact and enforce that belief. The original tells us, Gen. 7 : 19, 20, "The totality of the high mountains (*areem*) which were under the totality of the heavens were covered. Fifteen cubits high (*i.e.*, above the mountains) the waters prevailed; and the mountains (*areem*) were covered." Thus the Septuagint reads: "The waters

prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and covered all the high mountains which were under heaven; fifteen cubits upwards was the water raised, and it covered all the high mountains." The statement of Dr. McCausland is, therefore, exactly the reverse of the truth.

To prove that all such flagrant perversions of the Scriptures have the precise effect already indicated, I quote from an infidel publication of a recent date:

"No intelligent person now believes that it was a total deluge; Buckland, Pye Smith, Miller, Hitchcock, and all Christian geologists agree that it was a partial deluge, and the account can be so explained. . . . How strange that God should dictate an account of the deluge that led every body to a false conclusion with regard to it, till science taught them a better! But let us read what the account says, and see whether it can be explained to signify a partial deluge. To save the Bible from its inevitable fate, such men as Buckland, Smith, Miller, Hitchcock, and other Bible apologists, it is evident from their writings, were ready to resort to any scheme, however wild." . . .

"Had the man who wrote this story been a lawyer, and had he known how these would-be Bible believers, and at the same time geologists, would seek to pervert his meaning, he could not have more carefully worded his account. It is not possible for any man to express the idea of a total flood more definitely than this man has done. . . . Could any truthful man write this and then mean that less than a hundredth part of the earth's surface was covered? . . . But Jesus and the Apostles indorse the account of the deluge. Granted; but does that transform a fable into a fact? They believed the story just as our modern theologians believe it, because they were taught it when they were children, and had not learned better. . . . And in this manifestation of credulity on the part of Jesus, we can see the very false estimate placed upon him by so large a portion of the people of this country. Let the truth be spoken, though Jesus and all other idols be overthrown."

Such is the blasphemous argument to which infidelity is helped by the "sinful indiscretion" of Christian geologists.

But now to return. This "sinful indiscretion," which Prof. Sedgwick attributes to those who have advanced and advocated the day-theory already spoken of, unfortunately applies with equal force to his own ; since that interpolates vast ages between the first and second verses of Genesis, and is in direct conflict with the chronological details of literal historical fact as given by inspiration. Admitting the TRUTH of the Bible, and professedly its expounders, Christian geologists are bound to be consistent, and to adopt a theory, natural and rational, which, though not entirely free from embarrassment existing in the nature of the subject, is yet free from such stupendous difficulties I have mentioned as inseparable from geological speculation.

For want of time, I do not now propose to develop a theory which lies so open to all men, that its rejection in favor of the popular one is perfectly amazing. My aim at present is only to show, first, the utter inadequacy of the attempts that have been made to reconcile the Bible with it, and that, so far from this, the writers unwittingly have betrayed the cause of Revealed Truth, contributing strength and sources of appeal to modern infidelity ; second, to confute the representation that the strata themselves furnish irresistible proof of having been formed at a far earlier period than that assigned by Moses to the creation of the world ; and third, to protect the Scriptures from

the charge that they impose false facts upon men, which, though taken for truth by the Old and New Testament writers, really invalidate the entire Bible as the absolute truth of God.

The points of discussion regarding the facts and the forces pertaining to an adequate and scientific explanation of the strata as first formed, and then violently disarranged as we now find them, would require a volume of respectable size. I can, therefore, do no more than indicate the method by which *practical* geology may be shown to be in perfect harmony with the Mosaic record of the creation and of the deluge ; and that it stands in no need of such misdirected labors as have brought both into confusion to the apprehension of multitudes, and have needlessly given great advantage to the enemies of the Bible. Whoever may write such a volume or volumes will have the merit of counteracting the unhappy influences to which I have referred, and of securing the defeat of modern infidelity, with its ambitious scientists, upon their own chosen ground of attack. Any one who is tolerably well acquainted with practical geology, and with the sciences of chemistry and natural history, can readily scatter this mischievous theory to the winds, and exhibit the *first* facts of the Bible as the foundation of inspired truth, unimpeached and unimpeachable by its enemies. Something in this direction has been well done by Professor Martyn Payne, in an admirable work entitled "Physiology of the Soul and Instinct as distinguished from Materialism," published by the Harpers. But this

volume is too bulky, too abstruse, and covers too much ground for popular use. It, however, should be in the hands of theological students. Now, there are only three possible theories that can pretend to account for the phenomena of the crust of the earth.

The *first*, long adhered to, is known as the Wernerian theory, long ago advocated by Werner, from whom it derived the name. This theory represented the whole rocky and earthy matter of the strata as originally held in solution by the waters of the ocean, and gradually deposited by the specific gravities of their various components into horizontal strata, subsequently riven and raised by chemical causes. But it is now rejected for the obvious reason that the waters of the ocean are wholly inadequate to hold such a quantity and such quality of matter in solution.

The *second* theory is that for the confutation of which I have striven to exhibit its assumptions and impossibilities, in the main points of its construction.

The *third* theory is the true one, because the only one that scientifically accounts for the sources and the facts of the strata. Whence did they come? We say they came immediately and directly from the bowels of the earth, by those agencies which existed for the purpose.

First, because they could come from no other source, since it is acknowledged that of every quality of material found in their composition, there is a vast magazine in the depths of the globe.

Second, because the chemical and dynamical agencies by which they have been thrown up at various early periods, have operated with prodigious violence, as is proved by the vast number of volcanoes and volcanic cones and rents scattered all over the globe on mountain and plain; but now inactive, because the original force is exhausted.

“In referring to the vast magnitude of ancient volcanoes,” says Bakewell, “I have stated that they had doubtless an important office to perform in nature, and can it be unreasonable to believe that the earth itself is the great laboratory and storehouse where the materials that form its surface were prepared, and from whence they were thrown out upon the surface in an igneous, aqueous, or gaseous state, either as melted lava, or in aqueous solution, or in mechanical admixture with water in the form of mud, or in the comminuted state of powder and sand? Inflammable and more volatile substances may have been emitted in a gaseous state and become concrete on the surface. My object in directing the attention of geologists to this subject is to show that strata may be formed more rapidly than they are generally disposed to believe, and that the feeble operation of natural causes in our own times, however similar in kind, bear no proportion in intensity to the mighty agents that have formed the ancient crust of the globe.”—*Geology*, pp. 351-5.

There were thousands of them, the majority perhaps being mud volcanoes, throwing up at intervals the various substances which compose the strata, such as silica, alumina, magnesia, potash, soda, lime, iron, and other mineral matters which enter the composition of rocks and earths. Professor Emmons says, that “geologists in speaking of limestone seem to be averse to the admission that it may form a portion of the interior of

the earth, or even to admit that it may exist there at all; but there seems not a particle of reason against the doctrine that it may be as common in the earth as silex or any other of the simple or compound rocks." The same is true of rock-salt about which geologists have conflicting opinions, and of chalk, or pure lime as well. "The largest active volcanoes at present existing," says Bakewell, "throw out the different earths intermixed with water in the form of mud. Nor should we limit the eruptions of earthy matter in solution or suspension, to volcanic craters; the vast fissures or rents which intersect the different rocks may have served for the passage of siliceous solutions to the surface." "Calcareous or cretaceous matter is also ejected during aqueous volcanic eruptions. According to Ferrara, streams of liquid chalk, or chalk in the state of mud, were ejected from the mud volcano of Macaluba, in Sicily, in 1777, which in a short space of time formed a bed several feet thick." "Nor is it necessary to suppose, that these aqueous eruptions were always sudden, and attended with violent convulsions, for when a passage was once opened, they may have arisen slowly and have been diffused in a tranquil state; and by gradual deposition, or condensation, may have enveloped the most delicate animals or vegetables without injuring their external form." (*Bakewell's Introduction*, p. 352.)

"The matter called *creta* by Ferrara, erupted from Macaluba, was certainly a soft limestone, analogous to chalk; and though the eruption

lasted only part of a day, it formed a stratum many feet in thickness." As to this, Mr. Bakewell has calculated that at the very moderate rate of a foot a month for the chalk formation, it would require not more than a period of ninety years to form a mass of chalk beds, one thousand feet in thickness. And when we consider the thousands of extinct volcanoes that existed and were in active operation at all points of the earth's surface, covering all varieties of mineral matter, it is amazing how any other theory as to the formation of the strata could ever have been thought of, much less been accepted as rational and satisfactory. The formation of the earth's strata was unquestionably subsequent to the time when the chemical combinations found in them took place. Silica, iron, alumina, potash, soda, lime, and all primitive mineral elements must have been treasured up in vast masses, in such positions and relations that, when reached by aqueous and electric agencies, the results were rending by the earthquake and fierce chemical combustion beneath the bases of Etna, Vesuvius, and all other cones of volcanic character.

It would, indeed, be tedious but easy to show in detail how all the phenomena of the strata might have been, could have been, and therefore were inlaid by the agencies referred to, during the first two thousand years of the Mosaic history.

"The country around Baku," says De la Beche, "would appear instructive, not only as respects the emanation of inflammable gas, but also with regard to the production of one class of

salses or mud volcanoes. It was near Iokmali, to the east of Baku, that, on the 27th November, 1827, flame burst out where flame had not been previously known, rising to a considerable height for three hours, after which it became lowered to three feet, burnt for twenty hours, and was then succeeded by an outburst of mud, covering an area of more than 1,000,000 square miles to the depth of two or three feet."—*Geo. Obs.*, p. 412.

"In the Mediterranean a very complicated series of contemporaneous accumulations is now in progress, its uneven bottom being variably covered, according to conditions, by the matter brought into it either in solution or mechanical suspension by rivers; eroded from its shores by the action of the breakers, or *ejected* by volcanoes, the whole, excepting lava currents or large, sudden accumulation of ashes and cinders, more or less mingled with the remains of organic life, these remains themselves sometimes sufficient to form long-continued layers or beds."—*Ibid.*, p. 71.

"There are few things we can consider more suddenly destructive of terrestrial, animal, and vegetable life than these great volcanic eruptions, particularly within areas where several feet of lapilli and ashes can be accumulated over a considerable area within a few days. The whole surface, previously clothed with vegetation, with a multitude of land molluscs and insects, with many birds and mammals, may be all covered with a thick coating of these volcanic products; many of these molluscs and insects close to the plants on which they have been feeding. In regions where bogs prevail, large tracts of these vegetable accumulations may be buried, with many birds, insects, molluscs frequenting them, by a thick layer of ashes and lapilli, *the subsequent consolidation of which, by geological causes, might produce the deceptive appearance of a molten rock having flowed over them* without producing those effects which would, under the latter supposition, have been anticipated."—*Ibid.*, p. 124.

It is therefore apparent that these and other agencies might have filled the strata with the remains of all manner of vegetable and animal life during the first two thousand years, and have produced many "deceptive appearances," upon which

vast webs of modern geological theory have been finely spun.

It would be easy to show that the formation of the strata respectively, was accomplished in a rapid manner, and not by a long slow process requiring millions of years more or less for the successive depositions and hardening of the primary, secondary, and tertiary groups. The perfect skeletons of their *fauna* and the delicate structure of their *flora* never could have been preserved in a single specimen, but by just such quiet eruptions of mineral mud, and such sudden liberation of gas noxious to animal life as I have indicated. These would fix millions of animals in each stratum permanently in such natural positions as those in which they are now found, by a quick process not otherwise possible.

It would be easy to show that the great coal formation, unlike all others, must have been the work of the Noachian Deluge sweeping the entire *flora* of the antediluvian world into vast basins around strong trees by which it was entangled and matted, and sinking down in masses was evenly carbonized from bottom to top. All this can be shown to have been possible and in conformity with the laws of nature. No necessity, therefore, grows out of geological fact for the construction of a theory compelling us to the belief that the earth was formed either in a gaseous state, or in one of fiery fusion, or that the body of the earth is a vast liquid fiery ocean whose billows of molten rock are perpetually rolling a few miles beneath our feet. There is no necessity

for a theory requiring billions of years to account for the primary formation of a granite stratum, by an impossible abrasion of vast mountain ranges; or of granitic continents crumbled into detritus to be slowly merged and stratified under the ocean; or for the subsequent upheaval of a new world of mountains of different kind of rock to be worn down in the same way for the superposition of the secondary formation; or for others of still different qualities to be similarly worn down for the thickness of the tertiary, and so on. It is a gross absurdity, at war with the facts it pretends to explain; at war with the laws of nature as they now are known to act; and utterly preposterous in setting forth bald assumptions as scientific principles at par with those of astronomy, chemistry, and other well-established sciences. On the supposition that the forces of nature in the early history of the Mosaic cosmogony acted with far greater energy than they now do, as indicated by the vast number of extinct volcanoes, the period of the first two thousand years was amply sufficient to account for the strata and all the phenomena found in them.

The reasonings upon which the aforesaid geological theories have been based, are founded upon assumptions and not upon facts; hence they lose all their accredited value as scientific deductions; and the labor expended in bringing the Mosaic record in conformity with them is not only useless but mischievous and absurd.

The language of geologists naturally produces the impression that geology is a demonstrative

science, having laws peculiar to itself, educed from and accounting for the facts of the strata. But this is a mistake. Practical geology has no laws peculiar to itself any more than geography, since all knowledge in both departments is acquired by observation of facts and not by deduction from facts. Our *theoretical* geology has no more to do with the real facts of the strata than the theory of mesmerism has to do with the anatomy of man. Prof. Hitchcock, indeed, lays down seventeen fundamental scientific principles in his book entitled "The Religion of Geology,"—"the established principles," as he calls them, peculiar to geological science; but not one of them is adequate to the function of a principle in science. I will select four of them from an earlier publication. He says, for example, "The following principles may be considered as well established:

1. "The sea and land have changed places at least once, and probably oftener in some parts; that is, a large part of existing continents once formed, and for a long period, the bottom of the ocean, from whence it has been subsequently elevated, either gradually, or by paroxysms by means of a volcanic or internal fire." But this is not the statement of a principle. It is only the declaration of an opinion, and of an opinion, too, declaring its own perplexity between alternatives of belief. Again, he thus states another "principle":

2. "The whole crust of the globe, or all known rocks, have resulted from the operation of second causes, either igneous or aqueous." But this is

not the statement of a principle. It is only the record of an opinion founded on partial observation; and an opinion, too, in which the phrase "whole crust of the globe" is made synonymous with the phrase "all known rocks," which is an error, since a very small proportion of the crust has been examined, and the largest must forever remain incapable of examination by the agency of man. Again, he thus announces another "principle."

3. "For the most part, the processes by which the stratified rocks, especially the fossiliferous ones, have been formed, was such as are now in operation on the globe; and consequently must have required a great length of time for their completion, even if those causes operated in early times with greater intensity than at present." But this is not the statement of a principle. It is simply an inference founded on an opinion, which is disputed and not so likely to be correct because contradicted by other opinions of equal authority. Another "principle," he thus announces:

4. "The animals and vegetables found in the rocks must have lived and died near the spots where they are now found, or if drifted at all, it could not have been, in most instances, but a short distance." This is a very probable opinion, but it is a very ridiculous thing to be set forth as a principle. Thus I might go on through the entire list, and each one should appear to every man careful of discrimination, the expression of an opinion, but destitute of the character of a principle deduced by a scientific process; yet this

writer taxes with ignorance and presumption all who, with only a little book-learning, question the accuracy of his geological theory. But then we might ask, why did *he* write a book endeavoring to reconcile scriptural cosmogony with speculative geology, if it were not to impart book-learning, by which people might be qualified for a competent judgment in this matter? And if he, like all others making the same attempt, fail, by his own showing, why should fault be found with those who discover it, for pointing it out, to exhibit the folly of reconciling that which needs no reconciliation, namely, the word and the works of God?

A true estimate of the labors of our Christian geologists is thus made by an author in "Essays and Reviews," pp. 237, 277, Boston Ed.

"If we refer to the plans of conciliation proposed, we find them at variance with each other, and mutually destructive. The conciliators are not agreed among themselves, and each holds the views of the other to be untenable and unsafe. The ground is perpetually being shifted, as the advance of geological science may require. The plain meaning of the Hebrew record is unscrupulously tampered with; and, in general, the pith of the whole process lies in divesting the text of all meaning whatever. We are told that Scripture, not being designed to teach us natural philosophy, it is in vain to attempt to make out a cosmogony from its statements. If the first chapter of Genesis convey to us no information concerning the origin of the world, its statements cannot, indeed, be contradicted by modern discovery. But it is absurd to call this harmony. Statements (as to this harmony being complete) we conceive little calculated to be serviceable to the interests of theology, still less to religion and morality."

"It would be difficult for controversialists to cede more completely the point in dispute, or to admit more explicitly that the

Mosaic narrative does not represent correctly the history of the universe up to the time of man. At the same time, the upholders of each theory see insuperable objections in details to that of their allies, and do not pretend to any firm faith in their own. How can it be otherwise, when the task proposed is to evade the plain meaning of language, and to introduce obscurity into one of the simplest stories ever told, for the sake of making it accord with the complex system of the universe which modern science has unfolded?"

"The treatment to which the Mosaic narrative is subjected by the theological geologists is any thing but respectful. The writers of this school, as we have seen, agree in representing it as a series of elaborate equivocations—a story which 'palters with us in a double sense.' But, if we regard it as the speculation of some Hebrew Descartes, or Newton, promulgated in all good faith as the best and most probable account that could then be given of God's universe, it resumes the dignity and value of which the writers in question have done their utmost to deprive it."

This is severe, but just. The writer believes that the Mosaic account is "not an authentic utterance of divine knowledge, but a human utterance, which it has pleased Providence to use in a special way for the education of mankind"! Of course, then, the Bible is a fiction, so far, at least, as its foundation-facts are concerned; and infidelity is triumphant! But this writer *assumes* the very thing to be proved, and while he justly condemns "these reconcilers," he unwittingly condemns himself, throwing all into the hands of the enemies of the Christian religion and of its sacred books.

Truth, whether discovered by the leaves of the Bible or by the strata of the earth's crust, must ever be found in harmony with itself. The theory of revealed truth sufficiently explains the facts of practical geology, or at least shows itself in

agreement with them ; but the popular theory of geology is utterly contradictory to and can not be brought into harmony with the Mosaic Cosmogony by the wit of man. And since revealed truth is demonstrably the most perfect and oldest of the sciences, and geology demonstrably is not, there can be no conflict on a scientific basis between them ; for our theoretical geology here spoken of, is not only unscientific, but, as I have shown, it is not in accordance with the principles which regulate human belief.

Practical geology, however, is a different thing, and all it needs is emancipation from these preposterous speculations in order to drive from its platform all who confidently proclaim them to be demonstrated principles of physical science, by which they may successfully assail the system of revealed truth, essential to the true moral culture of man. Whilst I am ever ready to yield to them all they are entitled to, on the score of mental capability and acquirement, I hold that because their moral nature is uncultivated, such men as Spencer, Huxley, Darwin, Tyndall, and Haeckel will use their advantages not only for the advancement of natural science, but for the unholy purpose of making it the instrumentality of misleading those who confide in them, and of plunging their followers into the slough of infidelity where they themselves are found. These gentlemen and others of like mould are not to be trusted. They are the advocates of such geological theories as are presented in the "Vestiges of Creation," for the confirmation of which they are fond of

referring to the *admissions* and teachings of Christian geologists who agree with them on the points I have discussed, in proof that geology overturns the Bible, and therefore their own position as the adherents of infidelity is, they think, amply justified. Hence their "religion of geology" leads them to discard the Mosaic record, the fact of revealed truth, and the Christian religion altogether as popular delusions; teaching that "development" or "evolution," as scientifically expounded by themselves, should bring men logically into the belief of materialism, pantheism, or atheism, no matter which, since they are not responsible for their belief; and so long as they are emancipated from the thralldom of the Bible and the church. But it must be remembered that these learned men artfully impose a meaning upon words which they never have hitherto borne among enlightened people. The Scriptures inform us of the fact that "the Lord God made every plant of the field *before* it was in the earth, and every herb of the field *before* it grew; and God said: Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself." This suggests the fact of "development" or "evolution" from the seeds of things, in which men have believed long before our scientists were born; and it leads all reasonable men to recognize an omnipotent creative cause in a personal God, "in whom we live, and move, and have our being." Denying all this, however, they teach that development is the self-originating process of un-

folding all things, material and immaterial, in general and particular, whether of inorganic or organic matter, or of instinct, or of mind, out of one primordial cell, self-sufficient for all possible phenomena of mundane existence! And this they pretend to prove by the facts of geology. But their facts are not facts. They are only *opinions* based upon observation of facts. The facts of geology are all true, but the speculations formed to account for them are not. Having shown, as I think, that the doctrines of *theoretical* geology are not proven, and, therefore, not entitled to the claim of setting aside the common interpretations of the creation and the flood, and the doctrine of the unity of the human race; the admissions and concessions of Christian geologists will not avail our scientific infidels so much as they imagine in the labor of overthrowing the Bible.

“But we must not place ourselves in opposition to science, for that would be the ruin of Christianity.” Exactly so. Hence the duty of scholarly and Christian scientists is to uphold the oldest of the sciences against all “oppositions of science falsely so called.”

“But why not yield in the small matter of the interpretation of a few words?” say our Christian geologists. “In reading the Bible it is of the greatest importance to remember that it was written under divine inspiration, not to give us an exact outline of science, or a condensed handbook of philosophy, but to provide us with a revelation of moral and spiritual truth for the purpose of salvation.”

I do not forget the end had in view when God's benevolence was so conspicuously shown in the fact of divine inspiration. My point is, that all this is *logically overthrown* by concessions wrongfully made to infidel geologists. For example: If the word *day*, in Genesis 1, does not mean that at all, but a vast age of indefinite duration, how comes it that divine inspiration did not give us a corresponding term of language fitted to express precisely that idea? And when the same word, declarative of the times of the creative works of God, is inserted in the fourth commandment, how comes it that the *figurative* instead of the *literal* meaning of the word is used in a legal document naturally forbidding such use, and especially when no intimation of it is given, and when the people to whom the written law was first imparted must have understood this, like all other terms of its language, in its *literal* sense? Moreover, philology requires us always to understand a word in its literal and not in its figurative sense *when it is first used*. Especially must this be so in a simple narrative destitute of all figures. How, then, can we consistently suppose that divine inspiration would employ the smallest term of language in a way that must necessarily give a false impression as to the meaning of revelation? How often is it apparent that the littlest word is the biggest, and the most inconspicuous the most important in a sentence or a paragraph? This, I think, is the exact position of the noun DAY and of the conjunction AND, both in Genesis 1, and in Exodus 20,

as above indicated. Hence, a yielding of our point I conceive to be an abandonment of the doctrine of divine inspiration, and I think I may challenge a denial.

Again, in the instance of the flood, some of our Christian geologists, as I have proved, yield another point of interest vital to the integrity of revealed truth. If it were only a *partial* deluge, as they hold, how is it that divine inspiration has employed exhaustively the most general terms and circumlocutory phrases that could be used to declare its universality, when other terms and phrases could have been just as easily employed in accordance with, and descriptive of, the facts in the case? Here is a more flagrant instance of divine imposition, if the flood were only *partial*; and I cannot see otherwise than that a yielding in this matter is much worse than a "sinful indiscretion." The record of that catastrophe purports to be an accurate history of literal facts, and the language cannot be tortured into a meaning not apparent upon the face of the record. I regard an effort to do so a sin against God and a crime against man, because it is adapted to destroy all confidence in revelation. I do not see what can be more fatal to all faith in the Scriptures. The commonest writer of the present day would justly subject himself to the severest censure should he be guilty of using terms of description exactly *opposed* to the nature of the things he described. A witness upon the stand, if convicted of misleading in this way by the artful use of a single word,

would subject himself to all the consequences of swearing falsely.

The history of God's successive acts in creation and the *times* of them, the reiteration of the same time-term in the moral law, and the precision of the historically descriptive language delineating the flood, are everywhere in the Bible taken to be *literally* true. These first facts of the world are to revelation what the massive stones of a foundation are to the superstructure erected upon them. If, however, these facts are *fictitiously* presented in the Scriptures, their *inspiration* at least must be given up. That, to me, is as clear as light; and when inspiration is given up, the claims to it by the sacred writers must be estimated as just so many misrepresentations, and then it is not worth our while to contend for the rest.

Jesus Christ indorsed the writings of Moses as entirely true; and he represented Abraham as saying to the rich man (Luke 16 : 31), "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." He thus exhibited Moses as worthy of absolute confidence in all the *facts* related by him; but this implies an honest and exact use of words in relating them, otherwise it would not be relating simply, but fabricating, for deluding his readers, with no discoverable motive for so doing. It is a plain case: if *vav* (and), if *yom* (day), which have definite meanings put upon them by the spirit of inspiration in Genesis 1, and in Exodus 20 : 10, 11, may be subjected to the torture of

criticism working in behalf of human opinion, then other words and phrases may be subjected to the same process and for the same purpose. Thus Dr. McCausland contends that, "looking back into the remote past, beyond the Adamite era, as it has been defined in the book of Genesis, the man of science discovers, far away in geologic times, the flint folk of the quaternary gravels of Western Europe. He also recognizes the troglodyte occupants of the Belgian, German, French, and English caves, and the inhabitants of the lake dwellings in Switzerland, and of the Kjockmoddens on the shores of the Baltic, all of a later period, but long *anterior to the Mosaic date of Adam's creation*;" and then he exclaims: "Why should the religionist question this evidence of the existence of these uncivilized pre-Adamite denizens of Europe, and refuse to accept the facts it has established, more especially when they are not inconsistent with Holy Writ?" To bring the Bible in harmony with theoretical geology on this point, he says that the "Mosaic record does not pronounce that Adam was *the first created of human beings on the earth*. It only declares that about six thousand years ago God said 'Let us make *a man* in our image, after our likeness.'" Very ingenious! Who does not see that room is thus left for the creation of as many pairs for parents to the human race as the fancied discoveries of geologists may require at the hands of those who would reconcile the Bible with science? What next may be surrendered at the expense of reve-

lation to the demands of geology it is hard to guess; but I think it is time to plead with those friends of the Bible whose ingenious speculations turn out to be well-adapted implements of attack, which infidelity knows well how to use. Should these concessions be made, how does the Bible "provide us with a revelation of moral and spiritual truth for the purpose of salvation," when the Old Testament can be brought in collision with the New, and a chilling suspicion thrown over the whole? With a firm belief in their good intentions, like that of Uzzah in steadying the ark, I think our Christian geologists have made a sad mistake; and to relieve the minds of many distressed by their volumes, I wish to show that the *theoretical* geology which they advocate, is a very different thing from *practical* geology, which is in harmony with Revealed Truth.

Infidels are fond of repeating their favorite maxim above referred to. "No man is responsible for his belief." This, however, is utterly untrue, because man has a moral nature which does not operate by brutal instinct nor by mechanical laws.

1. All men are unquestionably responsible for their *conduct*. Were it not so, the restraints of law would be unjust and oppressive. Where no penalty can be exacted, no law can exist, the very idea of which grows out of the fact that a moral nature implies moral responsibility, which in turn implies moral law. If responsibility for his conduct did not rest upon every individual composing it, civil society could not exist, because *might*

would make *right*. It must therefore be held together by the necessary bonds of law. If its members do well, though approved, they are not rewarded; because they only do their duty. If any of them do ill, they must be punished, because the rights of others must be protected. This is so evident that no amount of reasoning or of illustration can make it plainer.

2. Every man acts voluntarily, and his conduct is the *result* of his belief, and bears to it the relation of effect to cause. Both partake of the same moral quality, and are alike worthy of the same praise or blame. If his belief be right, his conduct will be right; if his belief be wrong, his conduct will be wrong. Hence the accuracy of that descriptive passage of Scripture: "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."

3. Therefore all men are responsible for their belief, since all voluntary conduct flows from it, like effect from cause. The only reason why both are not treated alike by human law is because of its weakness and necessary limitation. It can not reach the seat of belief, and so prevent the overt acts of human wickedness. It can not go into the realm of thought and pronounce a verdict of acquittal or of guilt as to any prescribed course of conduct. But what human law can not do, divine law can; it enters into the domain of the moral world, and extends to the thoughts and intents of every heart. It can not be otherwise in *moral* government. The Law-giver therefore holds all men responsible for their BELIEF, because of their

intellectual, moral, and consequent accountable nature.

They who have the means of knowing what they ought to do are held responsible in human law for not doing it, though the omission be the result of pure ignorance; because *voluntary* ignorance does not excuse from imperative duty. Now, if this be acknowledged by every competent mind as just in human law, why is it not equally just in divine law? If, while we have the means of finding out facts and truths, which naturally form the belief that should issue our conduct rightly, our neglect to employ them will not make our consequent ignorance available for exemption from the penalty annexed to human law, why should it be otherwise with the operation of moral law upon all the participants of a moral nature? We must intuitively see that if there be such a thing as a moral nature resident in the human soul, it must be responsible for its belief. The proposition of infidelity is therefore untenable, because untrue.

The proof that Revealed Truth as a necessity to the wants of that nature is the oldest, the surest, and the best of the sciences is abundant, various, and strong in every particular. Put the doubts of infidelity and its decisions based upon them by the side of it, and see what a manifestation of imbecility it makes. At the very lowest watermark of evidence, infidelity itself must grant the *possibility* that the Bible is true. Starting from this point, I affirm that a thousand doubts can not diminish the weight of *probability* resting upon it,

because, from the nature of the subject, all doubts arise from ignorance and not from knowledge. They are wholly negative, and prove nothing. Let me illustrate.

If you try to convince an untutored mind that the sun remains fixed in the centre of the solar system, and that the earth, with her sister-planets, moves around it, he will object by the evidence of his own eyesight against your theory, and as you reason with him, he may hold you in derision. Although he be not able to gainsay your positions, yet "seeing is believing," and his doubts are sufficiently strong to keep him of the same mind still. Now who does not know that these doubts grow out of his ignorance and not out of his knowledge? They prove nothing against the truth of your position, and they are worthless, simply because they are mere negation. In like manner, positive proof is presented for the truth of the Bible. Doubts can not destroy that proof. The former rests upon knowledge, the latter spring from a want of it. When I say, "I know that God has spoken to men in the Bible," I present various proofs in the mass of internal and external evidence that support the fact; but should I say, "I doubt it," I must fly for support to my own impressions of the incredibility of God's giving a written revelation, or of the alleged facts and seemingly conflicting or inconsistent statements of the Bible. In the one case, positive proof originates moral certainty, and doubts can not invalidate that proof. In the other, ignorance of a thousand little matters ori-

ginates doubts, which a little information would have driven to the winds. The doubting mind can not deny the possibility that the astounding declarations of the Scriptures relative to futurity may be all true. It has no *certainty* that they are not all fact, and without *certainty* is it not madness to treat these awful subjects with indifference, when there is an acknowledged possibility that condemnation for sin, judgment, heaven, and hell may all be true, all real, all literal fact? Infidelity, then, because a system of doubts, is a system of darkness and uncertainty. It rejects the Gospel, but provides nothing in its room; it robs the soul of solid hopes, and gives her over to the inward turmoil and the ceaseless anxiety of doubts and fears. Such is the testimony of converted infidels.

Place infinite happiness and misery right before you, the idea of their bare possibility is enough, or ought to be enough, to make you more uneasy than doubts can give you quiet, because the one is positive, demanding your consideration on the score of common prudence; the other is negative, keeping you in hazardous suspense and ruinous indifference. The *worst* that can happen to the believer is that he is mistaken, the *best* that can happen to the unbeliever is that he is right. In other words, if the unbeliever be right, the believer has nothing to fear; but if the believer be right, the unbeliever must spend his eternity in hell. Who does not see, then, that all the doubts that ignorance can start can not outweigh the known possibility of eternal retribution? Is it not infinitely

unreasonable to take the supposed doubtfulness of the Christian religion for the same thing as a proof of its falsehood? Do not they who prefer a system of doubts to one of possible truth, as really lay aside their *reason* as the most extravagant enthusiast? Here, then, we meet the doubter of the truth of Scripture, and show him by his own reasoning to be the most unreasonable of men; because his doubts, which are mere negatives, he takes for positive proof against the Bible. His lack of knowledge he estimates as more important in this decision than the little knowledge that he has! If this be not folly, we know not what is.

But what shall be said of those whose doubts arise from smaller matters, as some piece of biblical history, or some remote fact whose brevity of relation affords room for cavil, or some alleged discrepancy of a few texts? There are among skeptics a great variety of opinion between confirmed infidelity and the transient scruples of occasional doubters. Allowing them all they assert, what does it amount to? Their magazine of facts, which they draw upon as from an armory for weapons against Christianity, is found in the Old Testament, whose history covers the first four thousand years of time. We need hardly remark that, by the necessity of the case, *brevity* of relation is a striking feature of the Bible, and no doubter can deny but that an expanded history of details would have cleared up every dark piece of history found in it. This, however, would have defeated the design for which it was given, namely, to be a rule of faith, by making

it an impracticable thing "to search the Scriptures" as our Saviour directs. And as they were not given for the mere purpose of transmitting historical fact, but for teaching and illustrating the doctrines of grace for human salvation, we see great wisdom in adapting a *full brief* to the opportunities and advantages of the men of all ages. The material for doubts is small indeed when compared with that which defies the ingenuity of objectors. After all that can be said, there is nothing like certainty attained against any statement of the Bible. Doubts can not demonstrate falsehood, nor invalidate truth. Who does not see how prudence dictates, that *certainty* ought to be attained by the unbeliever before he ventures upon eternal realities? Is it wise for even supposably immortal beings to stand doubting, trifling, slumbering over the great matters of religion, when there is danger of disputing and doubting and faltering until surprised by the summons to meet their God? What then, if it be found that judgment, heaven, and hell be just as the Bible represents them? Will it be any consolation to the unhappy that they have doubted until convinced by fiery arguments? Will it be any alleviation of their misery that they did not intend to be lost? Will their mistakes obviate their punishment? Or will they not rather upbraid themselves as fools and madmen for having put a few doubts against an awful possibility, and staked the interests of their souls upon the issue?

Noah, being warned of God, built an ark to the saving of his house. The wicked laughed him to

scorn, but he yielded to the balance of argument. He believed he had positive proof that God had spoken. All the doubts of his skeptical neighbors which proceeded from ignorance could not outweigh his positive knowledge. But what if there had been no flood, would not the condition of Noah have been as good as that of other men? Lot verily believed that Sodom would be destroyed, and accordingly fled from the city, against the remonstrances of his kinsmen. But what if there had been no such destruction, would not Lot have been as safe as other men? Joseph believed that there would be seven years of famine in Egypt, and he therefore laid up abundance of corn. But what if there had been no famine, would he not have fared as well as those who had made no such provision? The Bible has warned us against "the wrath to come," and taught us how to avoid it. We have positive evidence that God has revealed his will therein for human salvation. But what if there be no wrath to come, will the Christian be worse off than other men? How did it turn out with those who despised the warnings? The flood did come, and swept them all away. Where was Noah then? Ah! it was his turn to rejoice. The storm of fire did come. Where was Lot then? Safe upon the plain. The famine in Egypt did come. Where was Joseph then? Exalted to dignity and honor, next to Pharaoh. And the wrath to come will come. Where will be the Christian then? Exulting in glory. Where will be the scoffer and the doubter then? Let us remember, it is easier now

to fly from "wrath to come" than it will be to fly when it has come. I care not, therefore, what may be the nature or the number of infidel doubts, they can not weigh against the *possibility* of a judgment, and of a hell to follow it. I might start at this point and pile up probability upon probability, until the highest should be gained, equal to moral certainty. You might, on the other hand, pile up doubt upon doubt, you never could arrive at moral certainty. The Christian, therefore, has infinitely the advantage in his position and prospects, and the man who deliberately chooses the opposite ground contradicts himself all the time in all other pursuits, flies in the face of all analogical reasoning by which he is guided in other matters, and writes himself a madman; for he who admits the *bare possibility* of eternal retribution is manifestly guilty of the greatest presumption when he treats the Gospel with indifference, since by his own concession he may *possibly* be in hell the next hour.

The Bible asks no favors, the Christian religion asks no favors; all they do ask is, that men will investigate their claims honestly, conscientiously, consistently; and adjudicate upon evidence presented, just as they do upon evidence in a court of justice, by which they give verdicts that determine questions of vital interest to their fellow-men.

"A clergyman, now deceased, once told the writer (Dr. Jetter) that he heard the distinguished and eloquent John Randolph, of Roanoke, say that he was in his early years inclined to infidelity. At that time, through the influence of Mr.

Jefferson and the popularity of the French revolution, it was common for well-educated young men to avow their want of faith in the Bible. Mr. Randolph said that, scorning to adopt opinions without examination, he resolved to investigate the claims of Christianity to divine inspiration. He deemed it fair, as the Bible was a record of the Christian religion, to read that first. He commenced a careful and searching examination of it, not doubting but that he should find the proofs of its falsehood. He had not read through it, he stated, before he was convinced that a mole might have composed the Principia of Newton as easily as uninspired men could have written the Bible. His conduct was not always in harmony with his convictions; but subsequently, through all the vicissitudes of his remarkable and somewhat eccentric life, he was an open, earnest defender of Christianity."

When the Scriptures and the religion founded upon them are thus dealt with, the result must be an abiding conviction that they are of God, and therefore possess divine authority for the regulation of human conduct. Christianity alone locates an *objective* hope, like a lighthouse, upon the farther shore; which throws its beams athwart the intervening utter darkness for the encouragement and consolation of the soul anxious about the future. That utter darkness rests upon the inland sea of death. And when you slip your cable for the crossing, what is there but the lighthouse of Christian objective hope by which you can steer for the better land with no fear of missing your

reckoning? To this idea, in closing, I accommodate an old and elegant ode upon a lighthouse, the blaze of which was seen at night, from a distant hill.

“The scene was more beautiful far to my eye,
Than if day in its pride had arrayed it ;
The land breeze blew mild, and the azure-arched sky
Looked as pure as the Spirit that made it.
The murmur rose soft as I silently gazed
On the shadowy waves’ playful motion,
From the dim distant hill, till the lighthouse fire blazed,
Like a star in the midst of the ocean.

“No longer the joy of the sailor boy’s breast
Was heard in his wildly breathed numbers,
The sea-bird had flown to her sea-girdled nest,
The fisherman sunk to his slumbers.
One moment I looked from the hill’s gentle slope,
All hushed was the billow’s commotion,
And thought that the lighthouse looked lovely as hope,
That star of life’s tremulous ocean.

‘The time is long past, and the scene is afar ;
Yet when my head rests on its pillow,
Will memory sometimes rekindle the star
That blazed on the breast of the billow.
In life’s closing hour, when the trembling soul flies,
And death stills the heart’s last emotion,
Oh! then, may the seraph of mercy arise,
Like a star on eternity’s ocean.”

APPENDIX.

THE MEANNESS OF INFIDELITY.

ON the eleventh page of this volume, I quoted the following from a "History of Creation," by Ernst Haeckel, professor in the University of Jena:

"We need not trouble ourselves at all about the attacks of theologians and other unscientific men, who really know nothing whatever of nature."

To show the meanness of infidelity in the malignancy of such utterances, I beg leave to submit a quotation from the *Daily Witness* of New York.

THE DEBT OF SCIENCE.

"The last regular 'monthly concert' at the Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, the Rev. Dr. Scudder, pastor, was very appropriately made the occasion of considering the vast amount of work done by Christian missionaries for the advancement of science. By invitation of the pastor, George May Powell, of the Oriental Topographical Corps, repeated a section of a series of

geographical papers recently prepared and read by him before the American Institute. This section is devoted to the discussion of the work done by the missionaries of the fifty-four various boards and societies for the advancement of geographic and kindred sciences. He said:

“Probably no source of knowledge in this department has been so vast, varied, and prolific, at so insignificant expense to the world, as the investigations and contributions of these missionaries. They have patiently collected and truthfully transmitted a great amount of exact and most valuable geographical knowledge. All this has been done without money and without price, though it would literally have cost millions of treasure to secure the same by any other means. This work, as a civilizing and also a commerce-creating agency almost imponderable in its results, may be written on the financial balance-sheets of the nations as so much ‘net gain;’ all this as simply parasitic growth on the Tree of Life they go to plant.

“Much of discovery, especially in regions most difficult to reach, which has been credited to adventurous and enterprising travellers and explorers as their own, would be more correctly stated if written down as simply forwarded through them to the scientific world by these missionaries.

“One of the first steps in the march to conquer the topographical mysteries of unknown lands is to acquire knowledge of the languages of the peoples inhabiting them. On this head, he quoted as follows from Warren in ‘These for Those:’ ‘Our

missionaries on the Pacific coast are thought to have demonstrated that these thousands of islands were once settled by men of a common origin. So the original seed or parent stock is satisfactorily ascertained. How came they to this result? By reducing those many languages to form and bringing them within the range of philosophical investigation and classification.' The Ethnological Society, in New York, rarely holds a meeting where papers from missionaries on this topic are not read. Missions have furnished the means, says one, 'that enable the German in his closet to compare more than two hundred languages, one with another. He has at his command the most unpronounceable words in which Eliot preached; the monosyllables of China; the lordly Sanscrit; the multifarious dialects of modern India; the smooth languages of the South Sea Islands; musical dialects of the African tribes; harsh gutturals of the American Indians, and also the languages of various Oriental peoples.' Says Colburn: 'But for the researches of missionaries, the whole peninsula of Farther India would be in a great part *terra incognita*.'

"Almost equally important steps in this march are those by which we enter the realms of botany, geology, zoölogy, astronomy, and other departments of knowledge germane to this subject. Professor Whitney, of Yale College, and Secretary of the American Oriental Society, writes: 'Religion, commerce, and scientific zeal rival one another in bringing new regions and peoples to light, and in uncovering the long-buried remains

of others, lost or decayed; and of the three, the first is the most pervading and effective.'

"The outposts of the mission work are stationary, and scattered like the stars above, over the earth beneath. They are commanded by those thoroughly trained in academic shades, and who are quite as competent to throw the rays of the lamp of science as of ethics into the darkest corners of regions otherwise unknown. This permanence of location, and this scholastic training, together with their great number, combine conditions, inexpensively insuring a great amount, as well as good quality, of scientific work.

"'I have seen,' says Warren, 'a letter from the celebrated astronomer Herschel, expressing thanks to a missionary in Persia, Rev. T. D. Stoddard, for important meteorological discoveries. He pledged to Mr. Stoddard a vote of thanks from the Royal Society.'

"Carl Ritter, 'the prince of geographers,' confesses he could not have written his vast works, 'Erdkunde' and others, without the aid of material collected and transmitted by missionaries. He says: 'Their communications, diffused through essays, quarterlies, and various other publications, have become a part of the world's knowledge.'

"Champion's essays on the botany and geology of South Africa in *Silliman's Journal*, and on the topography of that region in the *American Journal of Science*, are a few only among the works of that talented and cultured Christian gentleman, who gave his fortune as well as his life

to one of the most difficult missions in the world.

“Said Professor Silliman: ‘It would be impossible for the historian of the islands of the Pacific to ignore the important contributions of missionaries to the departments of science.’

“The zoölogical specimens sent by Rev. William Walker, from Africa; papers sent the American Association of Science, by Rev. Ebenezer Burgess, on the geology of the Cape of Good Hope; and the exceeding important work of Justin Perkins, in determining the geology of Persia, are also cases in point. The *New Englander* says that ‘Zulu Land,’ by Grant—for twenty years a missionary in Africa—‘has the accuracy of a photograph;’ and Anderson says, ‘Williams’ Middle Kingdom,’ in 1200 pages, is probably the best account ever published of the Chinese Empire.

“Balbi, one of the great cyclopædists, is most hearty in his acknowledgment of the value of the scientific researches of missionaries, and Agassiz testifies that: ‘Few are aware how much we owe the missionaries for both their intelligent observation of facts and their collecting of specimens.’ ‘We must look to them,’ says Agassiz, ‘not a little for aid in our future efforts for the advancement of science.’ ‘The *Missionary Herald*,’ says Carl Ritter, ‘is where the reader must look to find the most valuable documents that have ever been sent over by any society, and where a rich store of scientific, historical, and antiquarian details may be seen.’

“It would require money enough to endow a society to keep even one man so long—who

should be, in point of intellect, character, and culture their peer—in the place of many of these field-m Marshals of science. Moffat has worked fifty years in Africa, and many others as long, or nearly so, elsewhere. Over two hundred of them are in the south of Africa; five hundred more are keeping watch of stars and gales, heat and cold, by the streams and mountains of India, studying its flora and fauna, and questioning stone and shell, language and race. They and many others are mapping and picturing and ‘writing up’ valley, plain, and mountain on continent and island, at the same time that they are lighting the fires on the altars of education of both mind and heart.

“Of the work of ‘the Kaffir Missionary, Livingstone,’ in these departments of science, as well as religion, we feel scarce worthy to speak. The sweetness and the sadness, the romance and reality, the grief and the grandeur of the story seem to say: ‘Stand before it in silence, and with head uncovered.’

“My own intercourse with missionaries—looking at this work with the eye of a business man—when in Northern Africa and Western Asia for the Oriental and Topographical Corps in 1873, fully corroborates the testimony cited in this paper; as has also my subsequent correspondence with them in the same connection. For versatility, originality, and executive ability, not only in the work they were sent to do, and are doing so well; but in their action as the foremost men and women in the East, to promote geography

and its attendant sciences, they stand before the world in a light almost past praise.

“In our country, missionaries have borne a part in the making up of its geography, a brief *résumé* of which would make a volume of rare value. We will take only time, on this occasion, to barely mention the intrepid and heroic Christian patriotism of Dr. Whitman—his statesmanship, we may say as well—in securing to us the gold, the glory, and the grand territorial expanse of the Pacific coast. In his mission work in the wilds of the Rocky Mountains, he discovered a plot to cheat our country out of nearly half of its present national domain. He mounted horse in midwinter, and struggled for months, through difficulties and dangers almost past description, to reach the frontier of civilization. On arriving at the capital at Washington, he found the terms of the fraudulent treaty (to trade it off for a paltry fishing-ground of not one-thousandth part its value) not only negotiated, but written out. It had been represented as inaccessible and valueless. He demonstrated its accessibility by returning over the mountains, the following spring, with near one thousand souls and their wagons and flocks.”

In view of these things, of which Professor Haeckel should have been aware before penning his little squib, it ill becomes these “scientists” to cast their reproaches upon men to whom the world is far more indebted than to themselves.
